

The South Atlantic Quarterly.

The Nationalization of Southern Sentiment

BY SAMUEL C. MITCHELL

Professor of History in Richmond College

When a statue of Oliver Cromwell was recently presented to Parliament, I was amazed to hear the fierce invective with which the great Puritan was assailed in the House of Commons by the Irish members. The wounds inflicted by a man who died in 1658 seemed fresh as of yesterday. Drogheda and Wexford, with all the incidents of siege and massacre, were vividly rehearsed, showing that the "curse of Cromwell" was still felt. These Irish members declared passionately that the Protector's statue would be an insult to them every time they entered Parliament. Granting that their wrath was partly assumed for political effect, and that the warmth of their words is characteristic of Celtic blood, it was yet surprising to find that the name of Cromwell awakened today in Great Britain so cruel memories. As all know, the estimate of Cromwell has changed radically since the interpretation of his career by Carlyle, Gardiner, Firth and Morley. Such questions were supposed by now to have no more than an academic interest; but here were the embers of the English civil war still glowing after the lapse of two centuries and a half.

In marked contrast with this is the progress that reconciliation has made between the North and South since the American Civil War, though we are removed by hardly a generation from that struggle, fiercer by far than the conflict of Cavalier and Roundhead. This speedy reconciliation is a proof "that the art of understanding adversaries is an innovation of the present century characteristic of the historic age." So gratifying is this union of hearts which were once dissevered, that it may be instructive to examine singly the causes that have made for the nationalization of Southern sentiment.

The example of Robert E. Lee has been a prime factor in the

restoration of good feeling between the sections. It is wonderful with what prophetic vision and nobility of soul he outlined, at the very close of the war, a policy of reconciliation that leaves nothing to be added even today. Writing to a comrade-in-arms, in September, 1865,—almost before he had brushed the dust of Appomattox off his boots—Lee used the words which served as a polar star in the guidance of Southern thought during our darkest hour: "The war being at an end, . . . I believe it to be the duty of every one to unite in the restoration of the country, and the establishment of peace and harmony. . . . It appears to me that the allayment of passion, the dissipation of prejudice, and the restoration of reason will alone enable the people of the country to acquire a true knowledge and form a correct judgment of the events of the past four years. . . . I know of no surer way of eliciting the truth than by burying contention with the war." Those are sublime words alike in feeling and foresight, and the man behind the words gave them effect.

The recollection of the creative part of the South in the making of the Nation has been a potent influence in knitting sympathies between the sections. Nationality in the South is not an innovation, but a return to an original course, from which it was temporarily diverted in the fog of the controversy over slavery. The late Lord Acton happily expressed the constructive role which Virginia played in the making of the American Nation. In speaking of the origin of our institutions, he says: "There was local self-government and federation in Connecticut, and spiritual self-government and toleration in Rhode Island; and from there the two institutions spread to the United States, and when the time came the Cavaliers of Virginia, who went out under James I., surpassed the fugitives of the *Mayflower*. They produced the Declaration of Independence, and bequeathed to America religious liberty and the political function of the Supreme Court. Of the first five Presidents, four were Virginians." To the same effect is the judgment of Mr. James Bryce in his recent work on "Constitutions." In referring to our Revolutionary era, he declares that "five men at least of that generation, Washington, Franklin, Hamilton, Jefferson, and Marshall, belong to the history of the world." Three out of the five world-actors, it will be noticed, hailed from Virginia.

To these views of foreigners I may add a sentence from Bruce, summarizing the South's contribution to the building of the Nation: "Through Jefferson, she had been largely instrumental in declaring the independence of America; through Washington, in winning that independence by the sword; through Washington and Madison, in establishing the national government by the drafting and adoption of the Constitution; through Marshall, in consolidating that government by a liberal interpretation of its powers; through Jefferson again, in doubling the area of the United States by the Louisiana purchase; and through Generals Scott and Taylor, in extending that area to the Pacific coast from Oregon to the Gulf of California." Monroe gave his name to a peaceful policy that embraces the Western Hemisphere; Jackson, by instinctive response to organic political growth, revised the democracy of Jefferson by the addition of nationality; and Clay was the author of the American system. These are proud recollections, and they made it natural for the South to revert to the leadership of her own immortal sons.

The frank acceptance by the South of the issue of the War as regards slavery, and the frank acknowledgment upon the part of the North of the blunder-crime of Reconstruction, have cleared the path of conciliation. Pertinent here are the views of Burgess: "Slavery was a great wrong, and secession was an error and a terrible blunder, but Reconstruction was a punishment so far in excess of the crime that it extinguished every sense of culpability upon the part of those whom it was sought to convict and convert. More than a quarter of a century has now passed since the blunder-crime of Reconstruction played its baleful part in alienating the two sections of the country." I know of no severer condemnation of the after-war policy of the Republican party than is expressed by this Northern historian.

The limitation of suffrage by constitutional changes in many Southern States, since 1890, has removed the fear of negro domination, and has opened the way for increasing independence in political thought and action. To hold the wolf by the ear is no longer our sole duty. In consequence, Southern men are breathing more freely, taking a larger view of all issues, and are growing restive under the isolation of the South from national politics. If there is no longer a valid reason at home for the predominance

of a single party, earnest men are enquiring whether we are not paying too dear for the tradition of the "solid South" by keeping our people in party leading-strings, by the general exclusion of our ablest men from Federal power, and by our scant influence in the molding of national policies. It is patent that by emancipation from the dominance of a single party, we should get these three stout advantages,—the educative effect of frank and full discussion of political issues before the people, a larger participation in national responsibilities by our ablest men, and the potent influence of the South upon national affairs. How long are we to sacrifice substantial benefits like these to the bogey of party solidity, or, rather, to the ring-rule of demagogues?

The growth of individualism throughout the South, especially in the past two decades, has strengthened national bonds. Common interest is a strong amalgam in a modern government. For instance, to the desire for free trade within a tariff union was due the consolidation of England and Scotland in 1707; the "more perfect union" of the United States under our present Constitution; and the origin of the German Empire, springing out of the *Zollverein*, formed by Prussia in 1818. And in the light of these precedents, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, in seeking to establish a tariff union between all the scattered parts of the British Empire, declares plainly that a chief motive is imperial solidarity and perpetuation. Such is the strength of the economic bond in this industrial era. Slavery snapped this bond by creating a different economic condition in the South from that which was growing up in the North. Whatever tends to equalize economic conditions in different sections of our country promotes similarity of view and identity of purpose. The cotton-mill owner in South Carolina and the iron master in Alabama are, perforce, responsive to the laws of trade as they operate throughout the whole republic. To industrialize is, therefore, to nationalize the South.

The Spanish-American war at once evoked and tested the loyalty of the South to the nation. The glow of enthusiasm with which the Southern people followed their leaders in that brief struggle, such as Fitzhugh Lee, Wheeler and Hobson, was due more largely to their sense of joy in a re-united country than to any martial triumph over the foreign foe. That experience proves how eager was the South for a chance to assert actively its national patriotism.

Burgess thinks that the progress of conciliation between the sections since the Spanish war is not due to the fact that the South and North then fought side by side. "It is," he avers, "something far more significant and substantial than this. It is to some the pleasing, though to others startling, fact that the Republican party, in its work of imposing the sovereignty of the United States upon eight millions of Asiatics, has changed its view in regard to the political relation of the races, and has at last virtually accepted the ideas of the South upon that subject. The white men of the South need now have no further fear that the Republican party, or Republican administrations, will ever again give themselves over to the vain imagination of the political equality of man. It is this change of mind and heart on the part of the North in regard to this vital question of Southern 'State' polity which has caused the now much-talked-of reconciliation."

A later and larger historical perspective has confirmed the South in its acceptance of the results of the war as regards nationality. We know now that the conflict in America was only one manifestation of a spirit that was world-wide,—the liberal and national tendency of the age. Since Appomattox, we have witnessed the nationalization of Germany, Italy, Servia, Montenegro, Roumania, and Norway; and we have rejoiced in the insurgent aspiration for nationality by such dependent states as Hungary, Bohemia, Finland, and Poland, while Ireland's efforts to secure home-rule have found a sympathetic response in our hearts.

Even earlier events than these have yielded a new meaning for us, such as the triumph of nationality in Greece, Belgium, and Switzerland. Indeed, the Sonderbund war in Switzerland, which grew out of the presence of monasteries in some of the cantons, is very like the American conflict over slavery. Hence, we have come to see that the States' Rights party went down in Switzerland, in 1847; in Italy, in 1859, when various principalities began to coalesce with the nascent kingdom of Italy; and in Germany in the same year. "In 1859, Germany emerged," says Seignobos, "from the absolutist and states' rights reaction and entered a period at once liberal and national. . . . Almost everywhere there was a national-liberal party contending against a state-rights autocratic party." Thus Appomattox is shown to be not an isolated event, but only one battle in a series that includes

Navarino, Brussels, Lucerne, Solferino, Sadowa, Sedan, and Plevna. As the city-state was regnant in antiquity, and as the world-state, papal and imperial, was dominant in the mediæval period, so the national state has proved to be supreme in modern times. We have simply found out God's plan in our generation, and have fallen in line.

The changing view-point of the North in regard to Southern issues has mediated differences in opinion between the two sections. The badge of the crusader is no longer fashionable in many Northern circles. A far more sympathetic mind is revealed in discussing Southern conditions. Slavery is seen to have been only one aspect of the permanent problem of racial adjustment, which is not confined to the South alone, but manifests itself wherever Europeans come into contact with backward peoples the world around. The South appears to have been placed merely at the "bloody angle" of the far-flung battle line of racial adjustment. This changing view-point in the North is due, in part, to its own frictional experience with negroes, Japanese, Chinese, and backward immigrants from Hungary and Poland; and, on the other hand, to a saner acquaintance with Southern conditions by personal identification with this region upon the part of many Northern people, especially in connection with educational movements, such as the Conference for Education in the South. The willingness of the South to tax itself to sustain a system of negro schools, inadequate though they be, has taken the sting out of Northern suspicion as to the fair treatment of the freedmen by their former masters.

While the leading periodicals of the North abound in instances of a kindlier outlook upon Southern conditions, perhaps the most suggestive expression of this gratifying change is found in Mr. Albert Shaw's recent work on "Political Problems of American Life." "The slavery system," he justly observes, "lifted perhaps one million white people to the position of a favored class, and led to the neglect and relative decline of the South's most valuable possession, namely, its five or six millions of plain white people of old American stock, who had very little property and few advantages. For the great majority of the four million negroes, slavery meant an immeasurable improvement in their lot when compared with their conditions in Africa. In any just estimate,

the disadvantaged people—for whom the philanthropists and reformers of the North should have lifted up their voices—were not the slaves, but the disinherited and neglected masses of white population."

Perhaps the chief significance that attaches to the present educational revival in the South is its effect in the integration of our national life. Like-mindedness is essential in a democracy. Whatever differentiates a section, tends to destroy union. In a republic like ours local self-government has deep rootage, but particularism has no place. It is axiomatic that the country cannot endure half this and half that. For democracy is fraternalism—fraternalism not merely in the state, but much more so in society, which gives shape to government. If a section becomes provincial, it will be thereby dependent. "He that loveth his life loseth it," is as true of the States of this Union as it is of the individual in his relation to his fellows. Hence, solidarity is a motive force in democratic education. The splendid efforts which the Southern States are now making to train all the children within their borders throb with national energy. The public school is the exponent of Americanism. Agencies to the same end are the colleges, of which a prime function is to give right orientation to their students; the press, which by its very profession makes for the public point of view; and general conventions, religious, scientific, and social, in which persons from all sections meet to advance a common interest, and, therefore, magnify the things wherein they agree and minimize those wherein they differ.

Such are some of the subtle and intensifying influences which are nationalizing Southern sentiment. Slavery caused sectionalization, because it placed the control of the "peculiar institution" in the State, instead of in Congress. That bar being removed, we are loyal to the Union that means merely "an organic relation growing out of the common origin, the mutual sympathies, the kindred principles, and the similar interests of the American people." The spirit of the present South voices itself in the memorable words: "The Constitution in all its provisions looks to an indestructible Union of indestructible States."

Culture and Commercialism

BY EDWARD K. GRAHAM

Professor of English Literature in the University of North Carolina

"He turns a keen untrammelled face
Home, to the instant need of things."

—Kipling's "*An American*."

I.

The words that stand at the head of this essay are, it is confessed, a little threadbare. They have both been overtalked. Commercialism, to be sure, has not had much to say for itself, but it has been persistently talked about. It has been abused for its unspirituality, for its vulgarity, for its tyrannical dominance over American life. Its antonym and antidote is understood to be culture. In the common usage to which this word culture is subjected it means the more or less superficial refinement that is concerned with taste and knowledge. The identifying of commercialism with vulgarity is of course unfair; and the conventionalizing of culture into a matter of books and knowledge is unfair, too, for it is a species of narrowness with which real culture can have nothing to do. To distinguish it we may call it academic culture.

It is to this academic culture that commercial America as a nation seems to be deliberately opposed, and it is academic culture that the average man on the street is a little contemptuous of. Real culture is broader. It is nothing more specific than harmonious development of the individual spirit. Human development has never approached the stage where it appears quite harmonious and perfectly poised; it is rather development under the leadership of some dominant idea seeking perfect expression. True culture may not be even a little contemned by any man. On the contrary pursuit of some phase of culture is a part of every man's life, and a culture standard is necessary to every nation that attains greatness—that is, that makes a contribution to the progress of the race.

Matthew Arnold, the English apostle of culture, spoke with insight and final charm of the true essence of culture. He did not

substitute superficial taste and knowledge for vital development of the spirit, but his emphasis did fall upon knowledge as the means of spiritual development. The cant phrase is not unrelated to his definition of culture as "a study of perfection," "a coming to know the best that has been thought and felt in the world." He explained that it was making right thinking prevail; but acquisition of knowledge, perfection through coming to know the past and its traditions, is the basis that he discovers. His programme of making prevail was rejected as vague and impractical by his contemporaries, and his conception of culture appears after all as academic and limited.

That Arnold's critics were the stout representatives of the rising working class is not strange. A steady consideration of his scheme will show clearly that the working class are the supporters of it, rather than direct participants in it. Freedom from "work" is necessary to it. Leisure is what this cultivation makes precious; and work is inferentially vulgar and slavish. Academic culture implies a leisured class, it implies the classical idea that the perfection of the race is attained properly through the perfection of a specially nurtured group. The best atmosphere and conditions for this whole idea were found in Greek life, whence with modifications it has come down to us. The Greeks made specific limitations—curiously trivial some of them appear to us—on the activities of a cultured man. Plato and Aristotle declared that all work that requires physical strength is degrading, and Demosthenes in a popular oration taunts Æschines with the accusation that in his youth he was guilty of manual labor.

The European and English idea of culture was formed on the Greek concept. A few years ago a violent newspaper discussion was aroused by the fact that members of an American crew competing at Henley were protested because they had worked their way over on a cattle-boat and therefore were not gentlemen. There is no purpose to over-emphasize the illustration; it is cited to bring into relief the fact that the academic concept of culture insists not merely that a man shall develop his spirit by studies and all gentlemanly exercises, but that he shall not degrade himself by manual labor.

The feeling that active labor is opposed to the highest development is the basis of the unanimous condemnation by foreigners

of American civilization. In a half dozen recent authoritative criticisms—English, Russian, French and German—there is agreement that life in America is merely a race for wealth; that it is altogether vulgar; that “the American does not remember, he does not feel, he lives in a materialistic dream,” . . . for him “life has no beauty.” Going back to Arnold we come directly on the basis of this criticism in his criticism of Cornell, one of America’s most typical institutions of culture: “It is an institution built on a misconception of what culture truly is and calculated to produce miners or engineers or architects and not sweetness and light.” Arnold would admit that good miners and good engineers and good architects are well enough in their way, but culture is not interested in the making of them; even in a way, they are illustrations of what culture is not.

Ezra Cornell founded the institution that bears his name because he felt that a true university is not merely a place where some fortunate few may come to know and to feel fine and beautiful things; his point of distinction was that it must also be a place where all men may learn to do well all things that need to be done. He must have felt that this business of knowing how to do is also culture, and needed institutional expression. Matthew Arnold looked at the effective product of this American workman and rejected it as false. If one compares Cornell, or Columbia, or the strong universities of the Western States, or better still the multiplying technical colleges—in glib American economy of nomenclature, “A. & M.” colleges—if one will put these institutions in view with the convincing charms of Arnold’s own Oxford, his criticism will appear but mildly to express the shock he must have felt. The contrast is indicative of the essential difference between the culture ideals of the life of which these institutions are the expression. The sum of the difference between the civilization of the Old World and that of the New may be stated thus: Work or business, or, as it appears, money making is here an end in itself; abroad it is a means of buying leisure to travel, to study, in a word to cultivate oneself.

To state it so is to condemn it in the eyes of many good Americans. They mistake the traditional European standard which served well its time and place, for the completely universal standard. The clear fact that the main current of American life has

been relentlessly set in another direction instead of leading them to despair should suggest that it, too, is impelled by the perfecting principle of a universal idea. Other considerations thrust themselves forward. Leisure and caste, the basis of academic culture, is an impossible basis for American life. So America, generally speaking, has failed to make any but weakly imitative or weirdly original contributions to conventional art or literature and but slight contributions to conventional culture in any form. Yet it has made important contributions to the spiritual progress of the race. These have their obvious origin not in leisure and caste, but in the precisely opposite principles of Work and Democracy.

II.

Whether American life has substituted anything for the old world standard that it abandoned is a question which Americans at large have cared very little about. The value of academic culture has been kept steadily before the public eye; the lack of it the average citizen acknowledges, however, with indifference—though not in the spirit of vulgar self-satisfaction implied in the foreign cartoons that conventionally picture Uncle Sam as a hog. A great though more or less unconscious idea of real culture is behind the undeviating commercialism of the United States. Minor manifestations of it are the establishment of institutions with the ideals that moved Ezra Cornell, and the forcing of the colleges founded upon old world standards, and crystallized around the classics, to conform in some degree their traditional curricula to the standard of American life. Larger manifestations of this culture spirit evidencing great vitality suggest as an answer to the indictment that the persistent materialism of the United States is opposed to the spiritual development of the individual and the race, that this civilization is, on the contrary, the one great progressive movement in present world development. Men will never again be satisfied quite with the culture pursuits of Arnold—with measuring lines from Keats and Wordsworth against lines from Shakspeare and Homer. Cultivation through the refinements of knowledge—the priceless sensitiveness to true beauty that leisurely unfoldment brings—in its devotion to *being* loses sight of *doing*, in its devotion to the subtle loses sight of the obvious, in its pious reverence for the past revolts against the necessary garishness of the present.

In pointing out the moving force in contemporary spiritual progress Tolstoy is nearer the truth than Arnold. In "What Is Art?" he phrases the fundamental culture motive thus: "In every period and in every society there exists an understanding of the meaning of life which represents the highest level to which the men of that society have attained—an understanding defining the highest good at which that society aims. The religious perception of our time, in its widest application, is the consciousness that our well-being, both material and spiritual, lies in the growth of brotherhood among all men—in their loving harmony one with another." All art, he declares, is valued finally by its consonance with this highest general aspiration of its time.

Here he defines an aspect of real culture and finds its present field to be in the personal relations of men. His analysis, verified in essence by recent world movements, recalls our attention to the commonplace that life is larger than literature, art or science. Culture is the complete art of life, and Democracy is its main active manifestation.

Along with the vague doctrine of Democracy, groping its way through dark ages of repression toward the present twilight, along with Democracy, came the principle of Work—active material effort. To illustrate both, a stage for a billion of men to live prosperously together on, an infinite opportunity for the development of their constructive faculties—an infinite *job*—was needed, and America was discovered. Its whole subsequent history has been an effort at perfection through recognition of Democracy and Work as true ideals.

Work and achievement and not greed are the basis of commercialism, just as the basis of a sound Democracy is work; and work is in itself a spiritual function and capable of developing the spirit. It is an end just as much as it is a means to an end. For this, typical Americans are content to "die in the harness." The elevation of work to a place of dignity in this country was not merely because of the necessity of conquering the country, and not because it was recognized as a basis of a sound Democracy, but just because it satisfied a need of spirit.

Recognition of the spiritual value of work came as Democracy painfully emerged into practical acceptance. It came, too, with the triumphs of the 19th century in science quite as naturally as

humanism followed the discovery of the classics. Humanism emphasizes art, science emphasizes the dry light of fact, and work emphasizes the application of fact to life. Humanism emphasizes feeling, science emphasizes knowledge, work emphasizes will. So Arnold plead for a culture primarily æsthetic, Huxley for a culture through science, and Carlyle for a culture through work.

Carlyle gives this strong expression to what is properly called his gospel of work. "Work is of a religious nature . . . a brave nature, which is the aim of all religion to be. There is a perennial nobleness and sacredness in Work . . . in Idleness alone is there perpetual despair . . . Work is communication with Nature . . . the real desire to get Work done well itself leads more and more to truth, to nature's appointments and regulations, which are truth. . . . An endless significance lies in Work, a man perfects himself by working." And as if this were not enough to say, he adds: "Destiny has no other way of cultivating us than by Work."

This is giving to the deed done well and the spirit of doing it recognition in the scheme of spiritual education. And there is spiritual uplift in every sort of material construction, in achievement, in consciousness of power to do. Emerson saw it when he said: "The purpose of culture is to train away all but pure power." So it is not by chance that this Yankee Plato, quite in contrast to the Greek philosopher, advocated some form of manual labor as necessary to culture. Nor is it altogether accidental that the great Philosopher, who transferred all of religion's dogmatic laws into Democracy's one cardinal principle, was Himself by profession a carpenter.

The general meaning is that the finest expression of the best self may be reached through the medium of effective right-spirited work. To say that culture in its broadest and most significant sense may be realized through material achievement is as axiomatic as to say that progress toward perfection may be made through sincere living. Truth, we are told, is not in the words of seers, but even in the lives of "one of the least of these little ones;" and so culture, which is *truth alive*, is not wholly in any words or things whatsoever, but only and wholly in the fact of a sincerely and profoundly lived life—a fact that our observation of the perpetual round of business irritations and shortcomings makes us always likely to forget.

The culmination of work is material prosperity, and commercialism is in essence nothing but the scheme of life under which a race of successful workers live. Steadily behind the social and artistic movements of history commerce has led a life of its own. Its iron arms upheld the artistic triumphs of Venice, of Holland, of Elizabethan England; but the so-called material concept, the concept of commercialism, never had full power to express itself until the republic of America, extended over an imperial continent and dowered with infinite natural wealth, came into the conviction that work and not leisure was the symbol of worth and the measure of equality.

III.

In no particular has the American ideal so strongly displayed its organic power as in subduing into unity the diverse elements that constitute its citizenship. The Union, the political expression of the constructive ideal, is just now coming into real existence. The culminating achievement of unification was the result not of a clash between geographical divisions of the country merely; it was a clash between culture ideals. The Union is a fact not merely because Lee surrendered to Grant, but because Lee's surrender was the first step in the surrender of a sectional belief in leisure and caste to the national ideal in Democracy and Work. It was the vivid clearness with which Lincoln saw this ideal that gave to him his heroic greatness and inspired his belief in the Union with religious fervor.

The learning of the new ideal was to the South the great fight. After the war the whole country became the battle ground of an absorbing economic struggle. In the contest, pitiably handicapped, the task of the South was forced upon it. It was the Titanic task of complete material reconstruction. In the gloom of bitter oppression, while the untrammelled North and East, under the nurture of national business laws, were constructing great business enterprises, while the untrammelled West was turning a fertile wilderness into immediate wealth, the South was in the throes of a passionate struggle merely to exist. Years followed years of grim, discouraging effort; but from this necessary work of reconstruction came the lessons of work, its dignity, its true worthiness, its rewards. Work became spirit and dwelt among us.

The simple resultant fact is that in the past few years the South has become prosperous. It has also become possessed of the exhilarated sense of prosperity. The fact does not remain superficial, however, for below it lies the fact that the South has yielded or is yielding to commercialism. National integration is the large resultant fact, and an immensely significant fact it is in present American history to the nation and to the section; because it is under the glow of a completely national spirit that "a nation becomes most intelligent, alive and creative."

The South, then, presents the interesting picture of a nation that abruptly changed its culture source. An examination of what the South was before the Civil War and in its poverty afterwards, and what it is now, strikingly suggests the contributions of commercialism to the life of a people.

1. The South has come into the possession of a sound general basis for living. Up to the period of its commercial success it was chafing under the stress of material timidity and restraint. The mood of the South was precisely the mood that in individuals we call worry, and worry means productive paralysis, it means loss of all effective power. Poverty naturally produced introspection, sectional sensitiveness, and other phases of provincialism. There was necessarily a lack of hope in the future, a lack of confidence in the face of great social problems. The forceful success of business enterprise changed all this. It found a sound physical basis for life. The mood of worry has been swept aside by buoyancy and faith; the sensitiveness of a fearsome provincialism has given place to a national consciousness that with widening trade relations will become international. Liberation from the vassalage to poverty has brought more than anything else spiritual liberation. The very aspect of the streets of the towns makes clear the fact that life is aglow with sound material prosperity. Ben Ezra strikes the note of it:

"All good things
Are ours, nor soul helps flesh more,
Now than flesh helps soul."

2. Added to this as a certain result of easing the physical load of poverty we come on another consequence of commercial success: it has brought the South a larger point of view. The subsiding of prejudice and emotionalism in Southern life is due in

large part to business activity and business ideals. Business has a temperamental opposition to violent feeling in all of its forms. The dollar is the one national symbol without sentiment or prejudice. Commerce denies itself the fine luxury of prejudice. It knows no inheritance of small feeling. Its relations defy local and personal limitations. Limitations that prevailed in religious, social, and political affairs are rapidly disappearing; women compete in every variety of business without prejudice to their social position; the force of ancestry is greatly diminished—a college student who waits on a table may be elected chief-marshal of his class; the rallying cries of blind partisanship have less and less force—a politician who openly expressed a determination to vote for a Republican president was recently elected mayor of a solidly Democratic town. The logical end of the dominance of commercialism is the disappearance of the political unity known as the Solid South. Commerce is the one successful foe to party allegiance everywhere. It is even in temper, cosmopolitan in ambition, and the humanizing quality of tolerance follows always in the wake of trade.

3. In addition to these qualities of liberation commercialism has brought certain positive qualities. The activity of commercial endeavor demands a strong intellectual grasp on the forces of life. The qualities that come with this may be observed as the especial and distinguishing mark of present effective Southerners—the generation that is successfully expending its energies upon the construction of its immediate civilization. "Nicholas Worth," in his recently published autobiography, analyzes the Southern mood as oratorical, a vague longing after nothing in particular. This record is a reminiscence of twenty or more years ago. Mr. Henry James, in his recent pictures of Richmond and Charleston, visualizes the South as a figure somehow blighted and stricken, seated in an invalid chair with a look of self-pity on its wrinkled face. The South Mr. James expected to find has to the romantic sense become that—a shadow of what memory still fondly dwells upon; but by her side Mr. James, in his concentration on the fading figure, failed to see the lithe, clear-eyed youth of tense muscle and heaving breast that his picture by contrast serves admirably to emphasize. What the immediate South is not, he shows us. Definiteness, accuracy, courage for details, quickness, confidence, power to

organize, the strong ability to utilize the opportunities for effective living, these qualities of mind and character no less than of business, and formed in the stream of life rather than in pleasurable leisure, are qualities that the spirit that has lately come into its life has so emphasized as to make them appear new. That it has multiplied wealth may be said after all to be incidental, when placed along with the fact that it has given the South a great business class of a social and intellectual efficiency that puts it in the front rank of the best forces of progress.

These are some of the characteristics of present and coming Southerners that have been acquired through the transference of the culture ideal. Although many beautiful things have no doubt been lost, what has clearly been gained is the inspiration of a great national spirit, the inspiration of equal opportunity through the physical well-being of all the people, freedom, tolerance and intellectual grasp—qualities that make the modern American the world's most effective citizen.

The foundation of Southern effort that is now identified with commercialism is not the mammon spirit, the mere acquisition of money. It is the finer breath of an heroic effort to reconstruct a commonwealth that was wrecked. It is passion for building, building with the divine, innate joy of a child, with the unalloyed enthusiasm of a man. It is the constructive spirit, and the idea that is ruling present Southern life is what for the want of a better word may be called the constructive idea.

No fact in present Southern life is clearer than that it is a beneficent passion. Not long ago a distinguished judge of the Supreme Court in a Southern state said to me with the simplicity of conviction: "If I had my life to live over I'd be an architect, or a contractor. I want to *make* something!" Making something is the key of the harmony. It runs through all gradations of achievement small and great, vitalizing every outlook upon life, every profession,—the vigorating idea of construction as opposed to analysis, criticism, retrospection, the backward look of regret. Behind the obvious facts of prosperity, materialism, commercialism, is the energizing, thrilling impulse, greatly and nobly to construct.

IV.

In the nation at large the cultural results of commercialism are obvious in national characteristics and in the considerable contributions that the United States has made to the progress of civilization. A great English publicist recently said that five hundred years of world history would be made in the United States in the present century. He meant, it may be fair to interpret, that the free spirit of material activity would here quicken the hearts and spirits of men into a deeper and truer adjustment of the relations of practical life.

That commercialism is altogether beneficent in its tendencies is most emphatically not suggested. It contains seeds of decay, as does every triumphant idea. Immediate history makes clear the fact that in the accumulated impetus of its effort it has overshot itself; but immediate history makes no less clear the fact that it has conserved power to correct its evils.

The corrective is the idea of Democracy. Democracy recognizes that power without service is spiritual ruin. The result of the recent upheavals in business, and consequent revelations of business rottenness—if beginnings of reform may be called a result—has not been a reaction in favor of academic culture, nor has academic culture been potent in effecting them. It has been an ethical reaction to bring back commercialism to its rational moorings of work and its business of perfecting Democracy.

The contributions that America has made to civilization bear consistent testimony to the belief that Democracy and Work are the heart of its civilization and that they constitute a truly cultural principle. These contributions have not been merely in the application of knowledge to improved living through invention, although it is significant that the United States furnished more than one-half of all the great inventions of the 19th century; they have also been in the application of fine feeling to life in carrying out the principles of a sincere and efficient Democracy. Achievement has been spiritualized by enthusiasm for social betterment.

The following summary, made by President Charles W. Eliot, of American contributions to world progress, may be said to illustrate unexceptionally this view: "(1) We have done more to advance peacemaking than any other nation; (2) we have set the broadest example of religious toleration; (3) we have made evi-

dent the wisdom of universal manhood suffrage; (4) by welcoming new-comers from all parts of the earth we have proved that men of a great variety of races are fit for political freedom; (5) we have diffused material well being among a whole population to an extent without parallel."

As we reflect upon these expressions of national life it is their spirit of service that denies them the category of crass materialism. The nation has shown under commercialism a capacity for fine feeling, and what is more, its main intent of making fine feeling prevail.

One of the most notable of recent national activities has been the policy of so-called imperialism. Critics at home and abroad have conceived this as but one more form of acquisitiveness and greed, tempting the nation to abandon its fine old doctrine of not meddling in foreign affairs. Such a view is superficial. What it lost was a selfishly safe isolation. Its policy of timidly conserving its own welfare became intolerable as its conquering commerce became international in scope, and it took upon itself the solemn function, full of dangers, responsibility and reward, of a peacefully militant Democracy. The spirit of Democracy cannot remain inactive. It is made triumphant through commerce and it is consecrated by service.

The extensive compelling powers of the commercial idea in America Emerson saw with characteristic insight sixty years ago. "The development of our American internal resources," he said, "and the extension to the utmost of the commercial system, and the appearance of new moral causes are giving an aspect of greatness to the future which the imagination fears to open. . . . the uprise of the new and anti-feudal powers of Commerce is the political fact of most significance at this hour." So it remains and will remain. It is the life fact of most significance. Then what shall be said of the aspect of greatness which this anti-feudal power holds in promise to present America with its wealth extended beyond Emerson's possible conception, throbbing with yet more complicated moral causes and unprecedented social problems? And this is just the beginning!

America has a culture standard by which in the long level struggle of time she shall be justified. The culture of a people is in the heart of the life that it lives and not in what by some past stand-

ard, however beautiful, it ought to be. To achieve a fully and harmoniously developed life for the individual and for the State is the only demand of culture. That typical men of America are not harmoniously developed is a criticism of life and not of commercialism only. Neither were the Chosen People of the Divine State, nor the Greeks under Pericles, nor the Knights of Arthur's Round Table harmoniously developed. Culture is not a knowledge of the creeds of religion, art, science, or literature. As American civilization confidently follows it, and it does follow it, it is not a study of perfection through "coming to know;" it is the development of the spirit through work—it is *achievement touched by fine feeling*.

V.

Such is the general nature of the life movement in American civilization. Its motive force is an aspect of culture, not its adversary. In spite of its appearance of heedless, relentless development it asks for guidance and needs guidance. At heart American commercialism is spiritual and it will find its spiritual leaders and ministers. In making for new ports, old pilots are not altogether authoritative; but compasses are not abandoned, and pilots there will always be.

Where will American life find its true leadership, and what qualities will it insist upon in its spiritual leaders? One thing may be premised: they will not be Jeremiahs lamenting the lost gods of another civilization. They will know the sweetness and beauty of the past, but their main source of inspiration must be sympathy and identity with the strength of the present. They will deal with a present that emphasizes sweetness less than light; but a present that none the less is following truth and beauty. The professed ministry of culture should make no mistake. It may learn from its own documents that the Gleam has no eternal locus.

That educational institutions, the conventional homes of culture, should revere the past, that they should retain in their form of government and curricula petrified splinters of mediævalism is natural; but in searching the past for things that men have found good it would be unfortunate if they should allow their eyes to become twisted toward retrospection, if they should thereby neglect the fine task of making better the things that men now find

good. The true apostles of culture cannot be slaves to tradition; they must be first of all sympathetic students of the present. For them to be of real effect—for the terms “academic,” “professor,” “preacher,” “literary,” even “cultured” ever to be other than marks of disinterested ineffectiveness—they must seize upon the central idea of the life with which they deal, work with its spirit and supply its needs.

Before me lie two recent utterances from American colleges expressing dissatisfaction with the work that is being done by these professional leaders of culture. One is a speech by a great college president, who declares that the colleges are not teaching effectively the things they profess to teach. The other a speech by a brilliant psychologist, who wonders if the conclusion of all the boasted triumphs of educational institutionalism will not be that the historian of the twentieth century will say that in this century colleges surrendered all real leadership to the “ten-cent magazines.” Along with these there are others calling to the colleges to bridge the gap between traditional ideals and the needs of the people. All of them come from the colleges, indicating that there is in American colleges a pleasing contrast to the usual refuge cry of lamentation at the innate vulgarity of the people. The two points of view, of sympathy and revolt, constitute the problem, and to an extent one has to choose between them. If the apostle of culture finds that his principles allow him no sympathy with commercialism, the devotee of commercialism finds that his principles allow him no sympathy with that sort of culture. There is perfect equality in their contemptuous dissidence. Arnold saw with horror a wave break over England of “American vulgarity, moral, intellectual and social;” he visited America, was cordially welcomed, was listened to with eagerness, and finally labelled by the keenly critical “reporters” as “an elderly bird pecking at grapes on a trellis.”

In reviewing present conditions one ought to feel emphatically that the source of a large part of the vital strength of the country is in those professions of spiritual leadership, the ministry and teaching. The feeling is not strong enough to save uneasy doubt. A man or two, here and there, stands out, but the feeling prevails that for the rest they are distinctly and contentedly unimpressive, and as related to the immediate life problems of the mass of the

people, retrogressive in attitude and positively unthoughtful. The culture pulpit, as it actually exists for the average man and the something more than average man who constitute the American commonwealth, appears to be the daily press and some weekly and monthly publications that with a certain self-consciousness of their mission call themselves "national."

For several years the church in America has expressed its almost consternation at its loss of the interest of the people, the loss of its ministers of intellectual leadership. Professors in colleges may not speak out on any subject of vital popular concern and expect more serious attention than such as hesitates between condescension and derision. Very deeply branded into my mind as fairly typical of the American attitude toward these professions was a meeting I once witnessed between a sensitive college professor and a prominent statesman. The statesman extended two fingers of his left hand to be grasped by the collegian, as he hailed with distinguishing welcome one whom the professor with some contempt referred to afterwards as "a successful person." The difficulty is not so much, it should be insisted, that the business of professed culture leaders is with the past, as that they have let it throw them out of sympathy with the necessary business of the present. If they have no part in the active life of the nation, they have not altogether regretted it. They may have deplored the popular ideals, but they have not sought to find the heart of good in those ideals and actively to make them into something better; but rather they have prized the seclusion into which the swift current of national life has carelessly let them drift.

It is not strange that leadership should find its perfect summary in the "untutored idealism" of President Roosevelt; just as the constructive spirit of the country does in the strenuous confusion of his multifarious activity. Whoever would discover the spirit of America at the beginning of the twentieth century will find the quickest way to it through the biography of Theodore Roosevelt. He approaches in the mind of the people the heroic because he is the exhalation of their national life. It is here he touches the national spirit, the national imagination. So all leadership must be from the standpoint of understanding and sympathy. And leadership is what commercialism has the right to expect of education, of professional culture in whatever form.

What Arnold's non-conformist critics said sarcastically has some point in fact: "The Almighty *has* a well known preference for University men." Knowledge is not resented, it is valued more than ever; but to assume leadership it must as always be applied to present life. That is what commercialism and Democracy insist upon.

To attain this leadership positive qualities of activity and force are demanded of culture if it is to fulfil its real mission in the overwhelming tide of our successful life. It must display qualities of masculinity, of visible civic efficiency that wins a place as an equal rather than claims a sheltered corner as a traditional right and has it granted with the condescension that is bestowed on worthy weakness. Professional culture cannot afford to adopt the attitude of the poor relation to commercialism: the one always a mendicant who timidly keeps his place; the other a parvenu who brutally keeps out of his. American civilization will never make its best progress until a more organic sympathy is established between the two. The source of American culture is American life. Professional culture must demonstrate its ability to foster and sustain vigorous life, courageously to lead strong men in the activities of sweetness and light, to carry on with energy the rough work of the spirit.

Sweet reasonableness is always the mood of culture, but sweet reasonableness is most admirable when actively displayed in times of stress. It must not be confounded with cloistered monasticism, academic immunity from discomfort, the selfishness that is no less characteristic of it than acquisitiveness is of commercialism. Let it become at all points, without reserve, to the full extent of its powers, the virile and militant citizenship of constructive culture.

Professor William James offers this suggestive warning: "If a college, through the inferior human influences that have grown regnant there, fails to catch the robust tone, its failure is colossal, for its social function stops, Democracy gives it a wide berth, and turns toward it a deaf ear."

Conditions in this yet young Republic, with all its crudeness and aspiration, its innately splendid virtues as well as its vulgarities, cannot have less than the thrill of a challenge to formal culture, in as far as it is sincere, to do a man's active part in the eternally new business of making a civilization.

Prohibition: The New Task and Opportunity of the South

By REV. JOHN E. WHITE

Pastor of the Second Baptist Church, Atlanta, Georgia

The great Prohibition movement is not suffering for lack of discussion, but it is suffering in some quarters for lack of adequate definition. The old definitions of Prohibition are not large enough to hold the new facts and forces at work today. Some good people are opposing Prohibition now for old reasons. They are arguing from defunct premises. Some people are against Prohibition because they were against it. Some are against it because they were once for it. Either reason is small reason. Some are opposed because they can prove that Prohibition has not been a great success in Maine or Kansas. Some are in favor because they are able to prove that Prohibition has been a success in Maine and Kansas. These are no good reasons for being either for or against Prohibition here and now. The good logic of yesterday often becomes dead logic tomorrow. The form is perfect still, but the life has departed. The premises have shifted since yesterday. "Let the dead bury the dead."

"Old Past let go and drop i' the sea
Till fathomless waters cover thee!
For I am living and thou art dead,
Thou drawest back, I strive ahead
The day to find.
Thy shells unbind! Night comes behind,
I needs must hurry with the wind
And trim me best for sailing."

What is the Prohibition movement? From the standpoint of the sociologist it is a social movement to fix the attitude of social institutions *against* a great social enemy—the Liquor Traffic. From the standpoint of the statesman it is a movement to set the institutions of government *against* a public enemy—the Liquor Traffic. From the standpoint of the publicist it is a movement to put an end to political compromise with a moral iniquity—the Liquor Traffic. This compromise of states with the Liquor Traffic was based originally upon the fear that the Liquor Traffic

was politically too strong for the state, and therefore the best course was to make it pay a tribute tax to the state for the privilege of unmolested traffic in the weaknesses of the people of the state.

The Prohibition movement in this new day proposes that society must not smile but frown upon its enemies, that government must minister positively to the public morality, that the state should have no part with moral evil nor share in its gains, and that the necessity of compromise no longer exists on any ground of fear of the power of the Liquor Traffic.

Now this movement is making tremendous headway all over the country,—echo of it is heard in Europe,—but the main-spring of it is located in the Southern States of North America. In the South it arose in its new significance and power. The South is the propagandic base of the national agitation. The concert of influence in Congress is gathered about Southern representatives. And it is in the South that the main demonstration of Prohibition as a state craft is expected—a demonstration on such a commanding scale and under such conditions as to afford an object lesson to the whole world.

That the Prohibition movement therefore means something in a large and peculiar way to the civilization of the Southern people, aside from benefits immediate and local, bringing a new and a great task and consequently a new and a great opportunity, is the conviction ventured in this study.

Eight months ago the prediction was publicly asserted that the people of Georgia were leading in a cause which would result in a solid Prohibition South. The statement at the time was interesting enough, rhetorically impressive enough, but it was not particularly convincing. In the light of events the prophecy does not appear to have been wholly chimerical. With the nearby addition of North Carolina to Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi in the Prohibition column, an unbroken tier of Central Southern States, fifteen hundred miles long, involving over half of the cotton producing area and in strategic relation to all that is homogeneous in Southern life, will invest the heart of the South in the common cause of Prohibition.

In contact with these States and overlapping them are six others, bound in an ancient commerce of sympathies and interests.

In four of these State Prohibition is at hand, with only forty counties out of three hundred and thirty-six in which there are any licensed saloons remaining, and in the majority of these counties no election has been held in twenty years to test the issue. It is this situation which on its face indicates the logic of the general conviction that the South as a section will soon present a solid Prohibition front to the world.

The question of concern to many people who are looking on with some amazement at the immense proportions of the movement in the South is whether society is morally disciplined to sustain it successfully and permanently. Answering that question in the affirmative, let me point out that the issue does not depend on holding to any particular form of Prohibition laws which a State may have started out with. The issue is whether the South is inaugurating a permanent attitude toward the saloon and whether we shall ever return to the old license system. Laws in their detail may undergo amendment in conformity to a general scheme in the Southern States, but the policy of Prohibition as a final treatment of the Liquor Traffic will not be reversed and will sooner or later be written into the fundamental law of each State. This conclusion demands more than a mere assertion. Prohibition will not be permanent merely because it is right. The movement will not succeed merely because one might wish it to.

Unquestionably all laws which limit personal action, even for the manifest benefit of society, meet with constant counter currents. The logic of those who insist that such laws require a fixed public sentiment and a preponderating public opinion in their support is sound logic. Unquestionably the contention that tempests of popular enthusiasm, however holy in purpose, always sweep back as the tides and leave behind a state of moral fatigue, is a sound contention. These principles have been demonstrated and in no cause more frequently than in temperance reforms. If the Prohibition movement we are now considering were a gift out of hand, or if it were the result of furious upheaval in public sentiment, no amount of ardent protest would avail against the inevitable and disastrous reaction. But in the present situation that which most assures the permanency of a Prohibition policy for the Southern States is just this principle of evolution instead of revolution as the guarantee against revulsion. The difference

between me and my Local Option friend who prophesies a return to the saloon system is not a difference in our principles, but over a question of fact as to the soundness and success of the educational process in which the Southern people have been engaged for more than thirty years. The Prohibition movement in Georgia, for instance, has at no stage been a popular enthusiasm. It did not come to power by campaign. There might have been a campaign as there is in North Carolina, but the result was already compounded in social education just as it is in North Carolina. The real moral deed of Prohibition was done without observation. Through steadfast perseverance of years its foundations had been laid. It slowly gained the land. It incorporated itself in community after community, in county after county—till the common social sense covered the State and spoke as the voice of the State. This is the fact explaining what we are now witnessing in the South. At the dawn of 1907 the saloons tolerated in a population of twenty-five million people numbered only half as many as could be found in one single city in the North. Moreover, when Prohibition gained a foothold in counties, it began at once to conquer the hearts of those who originally opposed it. Minorities were educated and absorbed and Prohibition passed out of the arena of controversy with these majorities of Southern people. Look at it. In the States which constituted the old Southern Confederacy there was at the dawn of 1907, out of their total of 994 counties, a preponderant mass of 825 counties which had adopted the Prohibition policy and were in the unchallenged pursuance of it. This was the situation when what is ignorantly called the "Prohibition wave," or the "Prohibition experiment," began to attract general attention by its rapidity of consummation. If the State legislators in the South had met in a congress to represent their constituencies in a vote on Prohibition as a policy, a congress of Senate and House members of the twelve Southern General Assemblies of 1907, the vote would have stood 1,400 to 600 in favor of Prohibition. It was this realized status of the public will that has made the Prohibition movement so easily resistless. Here were these vast majorities; what else could have been natural in a Democracy such as the South is? The immediate advance to State and general Prohibition is simply a normal movement to confirm in law what is already con-

firmed in social purpose. The momentum of the movement which astonishes the newspapers is the energy that properly accompanies the last blow of a long and patient hammering, the last stroke that sends the confident boat across the line, the last leap in the last lap of the race that wins the goal. The tidal character of the movement, the sense that everything is being borne irresistibly forward, shared by the liquor dealer no less than by the prohibitionist, the disclosure that for years the Liquor Traffic has been resting on a surely thinning crust of popular toleration, the calmness of the public mind toward its dismay and confusion at the disclosure, and the sense of finality in what is being done, which pervades the atmosphere, constitute a phenomenon of the Prohibition movement explainable only and completely by the fact that it is not a revolution but an evolution with roots deep thrust and a life history behind it and vital progress in it.

Another interesting fact in the present progress of Prohibition which differentiates the movement from all former temperance reforms is that in its narrow sense temperance is not its main objective. It is not an effort to make men good by law. Of course it purposes to create conditions which will assist men to be sober who want to be sober and will make it difficult for men to get drunk who want to get drunk. But a study of the controlling motive of public sentiment will reveal that its spirit is mainly what may be characterized as the higher social selfishness. The drunkard and the drunkard's interests are not the chief consideration, though these things are not lost sight of. It is the drinker as a husband, a father, a voter, a worker, a citizen—the man as a social factor, who is being considered. Consequently the movement is marked by an alliance of forces never before enlisted in coöperation against the saloon. It would have been impossible to bring radicals and conservatives together in a fight against inebriety as an individual curse or against whiskey drinking as a wicked personal habit. Almost nothing has been heard of teetotalism. The crank and the fanatic have not controlled its councils. Small emphasis has been heard on the stock appeals to emotion.

The Anti-Saloon League is justly accredited with the wisdom of a new sort of propaganda, and, where the League has elicited, combined and directed public sentiment successfully, the broader program of appeal has been insisted on and adhered to.

The people of the South are the historical partisans of personal liberty. They are naturally opposed to sumptuary laws of any kind. Thousands of men are with the Prohibition movement who have always had whiskey in their homes for personal and domestic use. They have not been aroused and are not aroused against whiskey *per se*. And it has gone contrary to the grain to contemplate as they do the limitation which Prohibition will place upon their personal liberty in that matter. But there they are, and it is the hopefulest sign of Southern civilization that they are there, for it reveals the dawning of a sense of social obligation than which Christianity holds nothing finer for the future of society. They are opposed to the Liquor Traffic, opposed to its investment of millions of dollars in a demoralizing social agency, opposed to its cold blooded attitude toward humanity, its essential lack of patriotism, its interference with industrial efficiency, its consistent alliance with crime and every evil, its necessary antagonism to all the agencies of character building, and to its particular peril to the peace and happiness of the South, which has the great problem of the races on its hands. In short, the intelligent people of the South are looking upon Prohibition, not as a temperance reform, but as statesmanship—a public policy, favorable to religion, favorable to education, favorable to industry, favorable to the coming generation, and as a necessity of Southern conditions in particular, and as an ideal of social obligation to a broad general good.

Where these considerations have never been so formulated, and with men who could not formulate such an explanation of their attitude toward the Prohibition movement, they are the real considerations felt with varying degrees of earnestness throughout the rank of Southern society.

In addition to the steady development of the anti-saloon conviction in the South, upon which Prohibition depends, there are conditions not found elsewhere which have contributed to its popular appeal and stand stoutly in support of its permanency. One of these conditions, in the judgment of some, is the probable explanation of the general attitude of the Southern people. I refer to the race question—the presence of eight million negroes.

The feeling of insecurity in the rural sections of the South on account of vagrant and drunken negroes had become a contagion

among the country women. A little of this sort of thing goes a long way in the South. Public sentiment has become intensely stimulated by it. Probably no demonstration under Prohibition will be calculated to make a more influential impression on the country people than to show them an end to drunken negro parties, the return from the nearby towns, and the courts uncongested by negro cases.

But more than this in real importance, for several years two ideas have been growing strong in the intelligence of the South, both of which have force in bringing on and fixing Prohibition as a settled policy.

The fact that the negro constitutes a child-people element in our population, that the great mass of the negroes are ignorant and weak and therefore are to be thought for in government and protected from the perils of liberty, is an ascending idea in the legislative scheme of the South. The moral basis of the disfranchisement movement was this: thousands of the best men—the justest men—went with this movement in consideration of the true welfare of the negro race, their thought being that through such limitation only could the discipline of citizenship become possible. This idea of the negro is more pronounced in the Prohibition movement. It stands out more nobly. The saloon was the ravager of the negro people. It plundered them at all points, robbed them of their wages, fed their animalism, and was, as every one knows, a debauching agent let loose by law upon them.

Another fact made constantly more prominent in the South's study of herself is a condition among a considerable mass of the white population not entirely unlike the condition among the negroes—ignorance, poverty and irresponsibility. This constitutes the other half of the race peril. The new movement in public education has made clear this fact as one to be seriously reckoned with. There are these thousands—should we say millions?—of our own Anglo-Saxon stock, not yet raised to a safe level of civilization, not yet, by education and opportunity, strong enough to reckon their social responsibility and to resist the elemental impulse of lawlessness, when racial antipathies are aroused. The obligation of a democracy to make law minister to their development is being felt more and more in the South and has a place in the interpretation of the Prohibition policy.

These are the two elements of Southern society that define the acute dangers of the race problem. It is realized that in any Southern community with a bar-room a race war is a perilously possible occurrence. The danger is not in the upper but in the lower levels of both races. There the inflammable fringes hang loose. Following the racial lines from top to bottom, it became evident to everybody that the lines of both races converged at the saloon, which stood at the acute angle of the inverted social pyramid. It was the attractive social center for the dangerous elements of our population.

At their hearts the intelligent white people of the South are sick of the race issue as a menace to social peace. They are tired of the depraved and criminal negro. They are tired of the irresponsible white man. The Liquor Traffic fostered and encouraged both. I say, therefore, that the negro is not the only nor the chief reason for Prohibition in the South, and yet its permanency as a policy will find always a ready and powerful justification in the fact that there are eight million negroes in the South, constituting the most difficult sociological problem any people ever had, which the Liquor Traffic only tended to complicate.

Along with this condition, peculiarly advantageous to the permanency of the Prohibition policy, there goes a corollary in the fact that the Southern States by their history, the homogeneous nature of their people, their sectional solidarity and their common problems, are moving together and are going to stand together in the Prohibition régime.

People who wonder at its uninterrupted progress from State to State in the South lose sight of history. State lines in the South, with all that has been said and done about the doctrine of State sovereignty, mean less than in any other section of the nation. Paradoxical as it may appear, the States Rights' agitation of seventy-five years ago was to be rewarded by the breaking down of State lines as real divisions in the South. It is interesting to imagine what would have become of States' Rights if the Southern Confederacy had succeeded. The old and proud conception of State individualism is not a moral fact in the South. History justifies this statement. In the Secession movement of 1860, the sense of sectional oneness of the Southern people was strong enough to sweep anti-secession majorities aside as the wind sweeps

leaves. The disfranchisement movement of more recent memory went on in the same tidal fashion. Contemplated, feared, at last dared by one, the other States followed it till all stood in the same line. The anti-bucket-shop movement records a similar history.

Now the Prohibition movement has been started in the same spirit, and it will be supported in the same force of Southern unity. It should be apparent that if New England had stood in solid phalanx with Prohibition Maine, the difficulties of Maine in the execution of her law would have been vastly relieved. The Southern States have a common task. It is an impressive spectacle. At last we are permitted a noble sectionalism, for however widespread the success of the Prohibition movement elsewhere, the South will feel a peculiar burden on her to make good before the world in so great a moral enterprise. Provincialism and even prejudice may find vindication of its past and pardon for its fault, when vented upon such an evil as the Liquor Traffic.

It is far from the thought of these statements of Prohibition strength and advantage in the South, to leave the impression that the passage of Prohibition laws ends the struggle between the Liquor Traffic and the people. On the contrary the Prohibition movement resulting in these laws is but the beginning of the great task of the South. We are entering an era of struggle, of agitation, of serious social strain. The larger good of the movement is to come out of this struggle. The character of the opposition to Prohibition is already revealed, in petty, nagging circumstances, in shrewd devices and in persistent efforts to magnify the violations of the law. For a while, until Congress amends the Interstate Commerce Law so that public carriers come within local police regulations, the clamor of opposition will be particularly annoying. The Liquor Dealers' Associations realize that the Prohibition movement is just as I have described, a new and an extraordinary movement. They are prepared to risk half their capital, if necessary, to check it. The signs of their desperation are apparent. Every influence that corruption can command will be devoted to the discredit of Prohibition. Anti-Prohibition sentiment will be sedulously consolidated and organized to excuse, exempt and applaud successful violations of the law. Therefore, the prospect before us is not one of peace and quiet. The next twenty years will mark a period of great strife in the South.

These are words of soberness. But the struggle and even the strife the Prohibition movement is bringing on is neither to be regretted nor dreaded. It will be a healthy warfare—such a conflict as seems to me providential at the present stage of Southern affairs. Sooner or later, the main and ultimate questions involved in the maintenance of the Prohibition policy had to come before the Southern people for a severe testing, a serious engagement all along the line. Prohibition as a temperance question—and merely so—is of insignificant importance in comparison with these issues of fundamental civilization. What are the issues which, as I say, Prohibition is about to submit to the Southern people? They are, first, *the sacredness of law*, and second, *the integrity of democracy*.

Our recent history has been forcing to the front, and in such a way that the matter was unavoidable, that the South as a section and the Southern people as a people were to be brought in some serious way to consider their civilization imperilled by a lawless spirit. It is not necessary here to explain how the Southern white people were forced into an attitude toward the National Constitution that gave us thirty years' training away from love of law as such. It is a fact to be taken into large account when we are explaining lawlessness in the South. But for some time public attention has been turning strongly the other way, to the fact that the question of law, the necessity of doing things by law, is imperative. The disfranchisement of the negro by law was the first great result of this return of social reason in the South. Having accomplished that, we cannot stop there. Having accomplished that, the white people have now to consider themselves. This is their civilization. It is what they are. It will be what they become. So I repeat, the trend of attention has been forced toward a realized weakness of our civilization in respect of law. There is a hopeful change of tone toward the statistics of lawlessness which show the South at a disadvantage as compared with the rest of the country—even the disorderly new civilization of the West. Our newspapers now publish them without that sort of comment that kills public conscience. They show the record of the South a sorrowful one, though for 1907 we are now rejoicing that our people were guilty of only fifty out of fifty-six lynchings in the United States as against sixty-seven out of seventy-three in 1906.

Now Prohibition presents this grave question with a new issue. Heretofore discussions of lawlessness have been chiefly in relation to the absorbing problem of the negro. The sacredness of law was put almost always in conflict with shocking crimes. The best citizenship of the South, therefore, had not been able to make more than a stifled protest for law.

But Prohibition offers an issue of favorable conditions for lining up the moral and patriotic elements of Southern society on the side of law. The task is laid on us to prove that we are strong enough in civilization to constrain men or compel them to honor laws whether they are pleased with them or not. That is one test to which the Prohibition policy will submit the South.

The other issue is the integrity of democracy. In a democracy, when the people are evenly divided on any great proposition, anarchy always lurks near. Democratic government is most secure in the normal nature of things when majorities are pronounced. But the question arises in connection with the Prohibition policy in the Southern States, whether our democracy is secure, if a weak minority can prevent the will of the people and defeat the execution of their will expressed in legislation. Look at the situation as it is in Georgia. The majority demanding the prohibition of the Liquor Traffic is immense. This is not disputed. Can the people of Georgia sustain their will? Is there not here an issue going to the foundations of democracy? It is not a question of the small and unusual violations of the Prohibition law, as in the case of all other laws against crime, occurring in the ordinary experience of its execution. It is a question of considerable bodies of citizens in determined desire to see the will of the people overthrown lawlessly. If the people of a State, representing an overwhelming majority of citizenship, cannot have what they legally have chosen to have, the failure is more than a failure of Prohibition. It is the breaking down of democracy. It would not be a failure of democracy, of course, but its vindication, if those opposed to Prohibition as a policy of the State should seek by appointed means to change its majority to a minority and get rid of it by repeal; but we are not about to meet an honest, open, patriotic effort of this kind, but a lawless, unscrupulous resistance to the Prohibition law by two classes—the criminal and the anti-Prohibitionist element which encourages the criminal by moral support.

The point, then, is this: The battle for democracy and law is coming on in the South over the Prohibition issue. It ought to be made an aggressive and uncompromising battle. Therefore the real issues of it should not lack for strong emphasis.

The South needs this struggle. Those who desire the civilization of the South to be a law-loving, democracy-loving civilization are called on to make it a triumphant struggle. The lines should be, and I believe will be, drawn sharply. The division is to be made and the issue joined between those who are in favor of the honest and successful execution of the Prohibition law for the two reasons that it is the law and that the people will it, and those who resist the law and violate it, and with them those who shield and excuse and wink at its violation because they are personally opposed to Prohibition.

The South has much to gain from such a conflict. It would mean a great progress. It is to be prayed that we are going into it really, that a great spirit may be aroused, a great agitation drawn on. The next quarter century ought to see in every State, possibly in every local and county campaign, a political excitement over the question of the Prohibition policy. Through such training we would come to an alliance of conscience on all the South's problems.

The Prohibition issue, as the issue of law and democracy, is the task and the opportunity—the wide opportunity of the South. It is the opportunity to get together and into organized relations the intelligence and moral conscience of the Southern people—for this and other causes. It is the opportunity to lessen greatly the unhealthy attention to the negro question, which has absorbed Southern thought to our hurt for so long. It is the opportunity to emphasize our recognition of the South's responsibility for the negro's moral welfare. Anglo-Saxon supremacy should thus be exercised in consideration of our kindly concern about his development in our midst. It is the opportunity to achieve a real leadership in the nation by example, by assistance to the Prohibition movements in other sections, and by influence in national legislation on the subject. It is the opportunity—the first since the civil war—to play a part distinctly, of noble proportions, in the moral progress of humanity at large, by the demonstration that a grand division of Anglo-Saxon States can

meet and master a problem that has always overmastered Anglo-Saxon people even in their oldest civilization; for the Drink Traffic curse is a world problem.

Abraham Lincoln wrote a remarkable letter to his younger friend, General Pickett, afterwards of Confederate fame, then at West Point, which closed with these words, the thrill of which lends itself to the outlook of the younger South upon the task and opportunity of the great years ahead:

"I have just told the folks here in Springfield on this 111th anniversary of the birth of him whose name, mightiest in the cause of civil liberty, still mightiest in the cause of moral reformation, we mention in solemn awe, in naked, deathless splendor, that the one victory we can ever call complete will be that one which proclaims that there is not one slave or one drunkard on the face of God's green earth. Recruit for this victory."

The Beautiful for the People

BY JEANNETTE MARKS

Associate Professor of English Literature in Mount Holyoke College

The time has passed when we are content to be content with a "stock-jobbers' heaven;" we are democratic and liberal enough to wish to see a little heaven on earth,—not for a few alone, but for all people. The very desire for these widened privileges of a new life here, wherein the wealth of this beautiful world, its air, its immeasurable spaces, its blue sky, its rivers and seas, its fields and hills, shall belong to all men,—this desire means changing much that is old into much that is new. For those of us who are taking our lives thoughtfully nowadays it is scarcely possible to escape thinking about these things, and good is it that it is so, for so must we after all share whether we will or not in the perplexities of the age. The peace of thoughtlessness is gone, and with it those stolid convictions of autocracy that God has vested any right in a few men to oppress and profit by the degradation of the many. The existence of the working man and woman has been fully discovered, and now today we are finding out what a gigantic power this same working man wields, power that can hinder the traffic of a whole nation, its railroads, its telephones, its telegraphs, its manufactures. Men can no longer be driven like cattle to their labor; there is a new warfare, a Christian warfare of non-resistance which has, too, its Peter and its sword. It is education which has done all this, which is helping people to express their discontent, to see what is wrong, to further what is right; and it is the discontented, silent two hundred years ago, who now attend to all reform. It is no longer one man with an idea in his head, but rather a hundred thousand, millions, with "victories tangible and real," who challenge our attention.

We are in a transition period when men are not only questioning, but actually destroying some measures of an old order. Nobleness obliges, and such men as Ruskin, Morris, Kingsley, Maurice, privileged to all the necessities, comforts, opportunities of life, were forced to consider by the very nature of their nobleness what some of the present injustices, disparities, miseries of

existence mean; to ask whether, after all, it is right that some few men should be supported by the toil of others, to ask what right we have to a higher position in life than millions of men and women who work harder than we, to ask what right we have to more beauty, more honor, more refinement than the majority of mankind? Their answers were not all precisely similar; even master and disciple, as Ruskin and Morris, differ radically in the final word. But no answers have seemed to me more earnest, more direct, more unselfish, than those given by William Morris.

At all times Morris could have withdrawn from the perplexities and problems of the life he led in London. But he did not, for ever rising higher and higher there beat upon his ears "the cry of a bewildered and unhappy people." Indeed, far from withdrawing from the problems, he threw himself into them with such indomitable courage and honesty that he drew upon himself, as other great men have done in a righteous cause, insult and obloquy. Well-to-do, university bred, he kept a shop and was a declared socialist. An accomplished poet, he worked at a craft with his hands under the customary conditions of such work. The most impersonal of men, having at heart the cause, the happiness of people in general, and not the conditions of individuals or of himself, he had the genius of great personality; he was unafraid to be himself and frankly unconcerned about what other people might think of him. He loved the world with all its beauty and possibilities; he was by no means a constitutionally discontented man. Nor did he have much patience with those who were habitually out of sorts. He asked of Carlyle's book on Mrs. Carlyle, "Should it not have been called the history of a great author's liver?" He thought that "to do nothing but grumble and not to act" was to throw away one's life. But he considered that good words in a good cause spoken among friends were like the music to which men go to battle. It was the thing done egotistically which seemed to him bad. Among his Pre-Raphaelite brethren he stands out heroic in strength and courage. Through those long years of remarkable friendships every one of those men relied upon Morris in some fashion for the peculiar virtue which was his and which they recognized as genius in an age sick at heart, perplexed, suspicious. Rossetti, under the burden of a personal tragedy, had withdrawn from the world, and died, so to speak, in defeat; Burne-

Jones lived aloof from all complications except those of his art; Morris alone plunged into the wretched confusion and sorrow of modern problems and, no matter what reserves one may hold concerning his poetry as great poetry, no matter what one may think about some of his wall papers, no matter what one questions concerning some of his romances and his political economy, as one watches him fighting for the right, for the beautiful, for peace, one's admiration for the man becomes unbounded.

His circumstances made it possible, but he was not willing to adopt a life in which there was no disagreeable or hard work at all. He was not willing to be privileged at the expense of somebody else. "As I sit at my work at home, which is at Hammersmith, close to the river," Morris wrote, "I often hear some of that ruffianism go past the window of which a good deal has been said in the papers of late, and has been said before at recurring periods. As I hear the yells and shrieks and all the degradation cast on the glorious tongue of Shakspeare and Milton, as I see the brutal reckless faces and figures go past me, it rouses the recklessness and brutality in me also, and fierce wrath takes possession of me, till I remember, as I hope I mostly do, that it was my good luck only of being born respectable and rich, that has put me on this side of the window among delightful books and lovely works of art, and not on the other side, in the empty street, the drink-steeped liquor shops, the foul and degraded lodgings. I know by my own feelings and desires what these men want, what would have saved them from their lowest depth of savagery: employment which would foster their self-respect and win the praise and sympathy of their fellows, dwellings which they could come to with pleasure, surroundings which would soothe and elevate them; reasonable labor, reasonable rest. There is only one thing that can give them this—art."

As he sat in his window at Hammersmith or went about his work in other places, thinking such thoughts, seeing such men, he became more and more convinced of the injustices of society. To him it seemed that civilization should mean the attainment of peace and order and freedom, of good will between man and man, of the love of truth and the hatred of injustice, and not more stuffed chairs and more cushions, and more carpets and gas, and more dainty meat and drink for a few, and therefore sharper dif-

ferences between class and class. He admitted the good qualities of our century of commerce: that it had broken down prejudices, given men more chances to live free, and that it really had stirred up new desires for peace and justice. But in his large sympathetic understanding of the average human being, his needs, his longings, his aspirations, Morris could not rest satisfied with the condition of things. He could not look upon a man merely as a part of the mechanism of labor, he refused to consider him as a machine to which machine-made statistics and a foot rule for living could be applied. He saw, however, that this working man was after all but part of a machine with an "unvarying set of tasks to do," a creature who became the more valuable the more closely he resembled an automaton. And what was still bitterer to him, Morris saw that the machinery the man tended was actually not labor-saving, but cost-saving; that is, machinery which should save the cost of labor. It was not being used to minimize the hard work of the world so that people should have more time for enjoyment, more pleasure in living, but it was being used to put a greater profit into the pockets of a few men who had already too great a purchasing power over their fellow men,—treasures, as his master, John Ruskin, wrote, "heavy with human tears, as an ill-stored harvest with untimely rains," and gold "brighter in sunshine than it is in substance."

The whole basis of our social life, with its contrasts of rich and poor, Morris thought "incurably vicious," for riches, he saw, had for its slave poverty; indeed, could not exist without poverty. Absolute poverty means degradation, and it is not a condition lightly contemplated when we think of the flood of humanity pouring into the world and out again, coming whence we know not and going whither we know not, all we know being just this, that the desecration of life here is the desecration of God-given beauty and goodness and truth. Morris did not pity men because their labor was rough, for that might often be a man's legitimate work. But what he lamented was that nature surrounds us with wealth, all that a "reasonable man" could desire for his "reasonable use:" the sunlight, the fresh air, the unspoiled face of earth, food, raiment and housing necessary and decent; the storing up of knowledge of all kinds, and the power of disseminating it; means of free communication between man and man; works of

art, the beauty which man creates when he is most a man, most aspiring and thoughtful." He saw, as Defoe did, men "living in a daily circulation of sorrow, living but to work, and working but to live," poor, unhappy wretches battling against hope, spending the wonderful energy of human life in the getting of a mere "dog's lodging and a dog's food." A system which brought to operatives food, clothing, poorish lodgings, and a little leisure, and to capitalists enormous riches, could not to Morris's way of thinking be just. And such injustice Morris thought was but emphasized by the contrasts of a class society, injustice which has made of our Christian morality precept and not practice; injunctions to bear one another's burdens, for the strong to work for the weak, the wise for the foolish, the helpful for the helpless, set aside except in theoretical preaching. The injustice of some class distinctions Morris follows with a pertinent question, "Why in the name of patience should a carpenter be a worse gentleman than a lawyer? His craft is a much more useful one, much harder to learn, and at the very worst, even in these days, much pleasanter."

First men worked almost wholly with their hands; then with the aid of machines; and now machines with the tending of men do the work of the world. So we have come upon a time when there is a surplusage of men able to labor, willing to labor, wanting to labor, for whom the world has no work. Morris did not believe that the spectacle of this modern tragedy existed to chasten and subdue the fortunate. Again and again he demanded four things for *all* men: (1) health, (2) education, (3) labor under proper conditions, and (4) pleasant material surroundings. Himself a man of extraordinary ability to work, accomplishing in a lifetime what it would take ten ordinarily gifted men to do, he had no desire to create a Paradise of Idleness. He thought there was no pleasure like the pleasure of hand and mind working together; that is, not mechanical work which is the result of the hurry and thoughtlessness of modern civilization, but intelligent work, even sometimes imaginative work. Morris possessed no hypocritical notions about labor being worth while simply because it is labor. Only labor that is really useful, serviceable, just, is worth while. Ours is no longer an ascetic ideal; we do not look upon living and working as a penance to be accomplished as best

it may in order that we may enter the Kingdom of Heaven, but rather we look upon our life here as a splendid opportunity for wise happiness, usefulness, knowledge, and thereby preparation for a life whose substance is but a shadow to us now. Morris thought that if the world could not be happy in its work it must relinquish the hope of happiness altogether, workingmen should be conscious of making something for men of like needs to themselves; it should be work wherein there is the knowledge of human necessities and good will, and the true incentive to it all must be pleasure in the work itself. Who can deny that working people have lost in large measure these pleasures, the natural solace of their labor?

It is the trade, the commerce of today that is aristocratic, restrictive, oppressive, and art alone that is wide, democratic, beneficent. Trade is impersonal, art is personal. And it is only as we desire the beauty of life for all, the beauty of the world and its image in the mind of man,—beautiful pictures, shapely ornaments, fair buildings,—only as we work to bring it to all men and women that life will grow better; this alone, as a great artist has said, will soften, and comfort, and inspire, and rouse, and lift up, and never fail humanity. To the ugliness of life today Morris would bring beauty and more beauty and all the wealth of nature. He saw that the outward aspect of the world was growing uglier day by day and that it was partly because of the triumphs of our so-called civilization; that beautiful buildings were being torn down and hideous ones put up, that cheap work was being substituted for lasting work, that cities were being darkened by factory smoke, rivers ruined by factory sewage, and that the higher and denser the civilization the less of beauty the common man could have about him. The arts were sinking lower and lower and it was simply the luckiest that would be eaten last. And the loveliness of nature, with all her recurrent changes, will go on, witness that man has deliberately chosen ugliness instead of beauty, ugliness strongest amid squalor or blank emptiness. Cultivated people do not realize that civilization as it now is inevitably brings ugliness with it, and their attitude towards the arts is one of languid complacency. People for the most part do not know what art is; they look upon it as a toy, something to be gathered into a drawing-room or stored away

in a museum, something which "can no more lift the burden from the conscience of the rich than it can from the weariness of the poor." Nor do they realize that this danger of modern civilization, wherein a few attain all the luxuries of civilization, will in the end deprive the whole race of the beauty of life and brutalize the rich as certainly as it robs the poor. Morris saw below the surface, saw that the outward aspect of life, with all its vulgarity, ugliness, is but the expression of an innate moral baseness.

Already the mass of the people is not in the least touched by the arts. It is for that reason that architecture, which depends on the taste of the bulk of the people, grows worse every day; it is for that reason that a refined and highly educated man can sit down without discomfort in a house which is vulgar and hideous. Houses are no longer a part of our lives; it is no matter to us that they express only the worst side of our character, both national and personal. Morris said that it was only here and there out of the kitchen that you could find in a well-to-do house things that were of any use at all, which were there for anything except show. And as for rich men's houses he had never been in one which would not have looked "better for having a bonfire made outside of it of nine-tenths of all that it held." If we do not care how we are housed, what will become of the arts, for just as the home is the center of our life of the affections, the source of our moral development, the guardian of our physical strength, so must it be the center, the source, the guardian of our love for beauty. Morris had much at heart the necessity for people living in beautiful places.

Like all important human questions, the problem reduces itself to a social problem. Morris thought that it was futile to "expect anyone to speak about art, except in the most superficial way, without encountering those social problems which all serious men are thinking of; since art is and must be, either in its abundance or its barrenness, in its sincerity or its hollowness, the expression of the society amongst which it exists." Morris wrote in a note to a gentleman who had invited him to lecture, "I have only one subject to lecture on, the Relation of Art to Labor." Indeed, he never wrote truer and more comprehensive words about himself. He had but one subject to lecture on—the relation of art to labor. And always he urged those changed conditions of life which would

make art possible. And always he hoped for the future. Every country has its awakenings when life begins anew, begins with something of the divine freshness of joy at its very source. Every nation has its renaissances, periods when as, for example, in Germany, all the people were musical, or when all the people loved poetry as once in Italy, or when all the people made and sang ballads as happened in England, or when all the people built churches as they did in France. Such a time seemed to Morris a golden age. But looking into his own country and his own times he saw, as we see, that because so much of the work we call art is dishonest work, the world of art is sick today. And not only dishonest, but trivial, meaningless, vulgar. We have but to think what a "monster" that Fashion is, that dictates the making of so much that is useless, that marks the unhealthful fever of living, that tells of the Idle Rich of society, who have not enough to do to keep themselves healthfully busy, but must be ever dressing up this changeling. The art for which Morris hoped, he believed would be for the elevation and good of *all* the people. He thought, too, that it was bound to come, for it existed in a time when there was less courage, truth, and kindness than exists now. A few men may think that they can cultivate art intellectually, and live apart from other men, despising them. If they attempt to do this, they will live in an enemy's country; at every turn something will offend their nicer sense and they will share inevitably in the general discomfort. Art will not be an "esoteric mystery shared by a little band of superior beings," it will be a part of every life and a hindrance to none. Morris remembered that the modern world has forgotten; he knew that there was once an art "made by the people for the people as a joy for the maker and the user." He saw that down to very recent days everything the hand of man touched was more or less beautiful, and he drew the conclusion every artist must draw, that all the people had shared in this art. And Morris saw that every day of this past has been a day when some beauty and invention was born and therefore some human happiness.

The thing Morris understands by real art is "the expression by man of his pleasure in labor." And from this labor there could be no such result as cheap art, one art for the rich and another for the poor. Art is not so accommodating as the justice or the

religion of society. Our museums are filled with the fragments of past ages, there because they are in some fashion beautiful; it is worth noting that these things, bought now at a great price and the object of modern study, were, when new, to be bought in almost any market at reasonable prices. They were not the treasures of connoisseurs as today so much of man's beautiful handiwork unfortunately is. Let the arts grow popular, declared Morris, and the greater part of the curse of labor will cease. And by "popular" Morris did not mean even to suggest such a thing as cheapness or triviality, often the sense in which we use that word today. He realized that the conditions of life are so stern and unplayful that nothing could take any hold on people which was not rooted deep in reality. According to Morris a certain moral quality is a necessity; in art he despised hypocrisy, cowardice, vagueness, and he did not over-emphasize mere technical failures. What he says of a good design might well apply also to a good essay or a good story. He had no patience with "slobbering" and "messaging" about; his advice was to think out a design before you put it on paper; "without order your work cannot even exist; without meaning it were better not to exist." He was no advocate of color for color's sake, an accusation often brought against the Pre-Raphaelites. He knew color from that point of view would never take a strong hold on our Western civilization. To have a meaning and to make others feel and understand it, must ever be the aim and end of our Western art.

Morris made two divisions of the arts, (1) intellectual, i.e., that which addresses itself wholly to our mental needs, and (2) decorative, intended primarily for the service of the body. One, you see, might exist even if our needs were all spiritual, but the other kind, called into existence by bodily needs, must also recognize the needs of the soul. Then Morris, true poet, true artist that he is, looks back into the past and sees that there was a time when such a distinction did not exist, when the painter, as Walter Crane says, whether painting a manuscript, a coffer, a ceiling, a wall, an altar piece, was "possessed with a paramount impulse to decorate, to make the space or surface he dealt with as lovely to the eye in design or color as he had skill to do." In its early history and in the Middle Ages painting was an applied art. But from this modern division of the arts, this division between the

man who paints a few square feet of canvass and the man who decorates your wall, this separation between the wood-carver and the sculptor, this separation between the "artist" who makes the model in clay and the artisan who cuts it out in stone, this separation between the architect who draws the plans and the man who carries them out, grave difficulties have arisen, due largely to the commercializing of modern life. Short leases, dirt, restlessness, nomadic centerless lives, have made seemingly a new order of workman, a new order of house, a new order of decoration (if such it can be called), a new order of furniture necessary, all ephemeral. These things have led to a taste controlled by a desire for novelty and not by standards of what is beautifully, lastingly and fitly expressed in vase, in wall paper, in table or in cabinet. The disunion between the lesser and the greater arts has made the lesser trivial, mechanical, unintelligent; and has lost for the greater arts the dignity of being popular, making of what is essentially great, free, democratic, an adjunct of pomp, a rich man's toy.

The relation of the arts to the center of the emotional life, the *Home*, the house, is what gives them dignity and seriousness. Our Western arts depend absolutely upon architecture—I use the word architecture in its largest sense. As we see this commercializing, vulgarizing, de-vitalizing of our homes, we realize the gravity of the problem. It was the recognition of that pervasive malady that led to the founding of the modern Arts and Crafts movement, a title the invention of Mr. T. J. Cobden-Sanderson, of the Dove Book Bindery, and a movement established by such men as William Morris, Walter Crane, Robinson, Benson, Webb, Somers Clarke, Ricardo, Blomfield and others. The test of this new arts and crafts work was not the clever doing of a thing, but the right doing of it. And so successful has their work been that some of us are beginning to know the difference between a showy book and a really beautiful one, some of us are beginning to forget short leases and perishable houses and to buy those things, so far as we can, that are permanently beautiful and useful; some of us are beginning to see the difference between cheap, vulgar, unintelligent work with a "shop-counter look" and work that is the result of artistic finish, and some of us are thinking twice before we buy cheap articles, realizing that what is cheap to us has cer-

tainly cheapened the life of some man or woman for whom the necessities of existence have become a daily anxiety and struggle.

Mr. W. A. S. Benson says, "The distinction between good and bad in art eludes definition; it is not an affair of reason, but of perception." And we might add that the creation of it is not an affair of commerce, but of life. Commerce makes all it can *out* of people, art gives all it can *to* them. The instant the artist (that is the workman) ceases to deal with "a public of friends and neighbors" that instant his art deteriorates. The workman's pleasure in handicraft is compounded of three elements: variety, hope of creation, self-respect that comes of usefulness; also a fourth pleasure, that which goes with the exercise of bodily powers. According to Morris "nothing can be a work of art which is not useful; that is to say, which does not minister to the body when well under command of the mind, or which does not amuse, soothe, or elevate the mind in a healthy state." The one great office of decoration is to give people pleasure in the things they must *use*, the other to give them pleasure in the things they must *make*. Everything made by our hands has inevitably a form which is either beautiful or ugly, beautiful if it is in accord with nature and helps her, ugly if discordant and hinders her. The first requisites of that which shall be permanently beautiful are simplicity and solidity—those things which can receive the joys of others and bear their sorrows and "still look as kind to us as to them." Even with means the humblest, with whitewash for our walls and scoured deal for our tables, it is possible, nay, it is easy, to make a home attractive. The simplest room may be dignified, serene, useful and so attain the end of culture, which is peace and happiness. The beauty of suitableness is something of which the modern world, forever "on the make," knows but little. Of one thing, at least, we may be quite certain: that in such a humble place the furniture of a tawdry French régime, the gimcracks of a more modern period will add no beauty.

Morris was not content, nor are we, that life should be recklessly wasted in the pursuit of ignoble ends. Every man, he says, must think for himself and be intelligently responsible to society. No man shall be a slave to the making of another's luxuries, and to this end we are to do with as few things as possible. For the sake of beauty and decency we are to sacrifice some of the things

about which we are so busy, and we are to realize that the beauty of life which is meant by art is no mere accident which we may take or not as we please; it is rather a positive necessity, if body and soul are to live healthfully together; it must be a part of every life. Such democratic aims of art shall make for the ennobling of daily and common work wherein hope and pleasure will be the forces that keep the world a-going. Art shall be the solace of our labor, "the romance . . . of the difficult art of living." And we shall find, as we find our childhood, our simplicity, our sincerity once more, happiness and interest in the performance and beautifying of the little details of every day. Art shall be recognized in the commonest and humblest objects. And to these simple pleasures shall be added peace, that restfulness which is the essential aim of beauty.

The Bible as English Literature

By EDWARD A. ALLEN

Professor of English in the University of Missouri

When we speak of the Bible as a work of literature, as the noblest prose in the whole range of English literature from the good King Alfred down to the present time, it is now come to be understood that we mean, not any of the recent translations, such as the Revised Version and the Twentieth Century New Testament, admirable as they are in many respects, but the so-called Authorized Version of 1611, commonly known as the King James Bible. The Revised Version of 1881, made necessary, for one thing, by the change of meaning in many English words, such as *conversation*, *prevent*, and numerous others well known, follows more closely the Authorized Version than do any of the later translations, and hence comes nearer to it in literary value. In their Preface the revisers say: "We have had to study this great Version carefully and minutely line by line; and the longer we have been engaged upon it the more we have learned to admire its simplicity, its dignity, its power, its happy turns of expression, and its general accuracy, and, we must not fail to add, the music of its cadences and the felicities of its rhythm."

And to the credit of the revisers, be it said, they made as few changes as possible consistently with faithfulness to the task before them. A striking difference in point of style between the two versions is the use of various synonyms in the Authorized Version, while the New Version made it a rule to translate a word in the original by one and the same word in English, however often it might occur in the sentence. This is a gain on the one hand and a loss on the other; a gain on the side of accuracy and a loss on the side of euphony. In literature words connote so much more than they denote that to my students I have sometimes said in my haste, "There are no synonyms." And this is true, if by synonyms are meant words of similar meaning that may be used indifferently by masters of style. The words *kingly*, *royal*, and *regal* are fair examples of synonyms; they have the same meaning, and yet in the following passages no one with an

ear for the musical assonance of words would fail to note the difference in effect, or dare substitute one for another:

"What seemed his head the likeness of a *kingly crown* had on."

—Milton: *Par. Lost*, II., 672.

"'Twas at the *royal feast* for Persia won."

—Dryden: *Alexander's Feast*.

"Close by the *regal chair*

Fell thirst and famine scowl

A baleful smile upon their baffled guest."

—Gray: *The Bard*.

A good illustration is found in *James II.*, 2:

"For if there come into your synagogue a man with a gold ring, in fine clothing, and there come in also a poor man in vile clothing; and ye have regard to him that weareth fine clothing," etc.

In the Authorized Version it reads:

"For if there come into your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment; and ye have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing," etc.,

where the one Greek word is translated by *apparel*, *raiment* and *clothing*. Though in this particular passage little seems to be gained by the use of synonyms, yet on the whole the rhythm of the old version has been seriously impaired by the alterations in the new. Let it be borne in mind, however, that we are speaking here merely of literary values; for purposes of exegesis, of knowing what the original texts contain, the deviations from the old version, all on the side of greater clearness and accuracy, make the Revised Version indispensable. Matthew Arnold seems to me over-fastidious when he says, in his "Isaiah of Jerusalem:" "If by an act of authority the new version could be made to supersede the old and the old to go out of use, a blow would be struck at religion in this country far more dangerous to it than the hindrances with which it has to contend now—beer shops, dissent, ritualism, the Salvation Army, and the rest of the long and sad list. The new enemy would be indifference to a New Testament which failed to delight and move men like the Old, and to fix its phrases in their memory."

The Twentieth Century New Testament is not a revision, as are all other versions of the Bible from the sixteenth century down. It is an independent translation, an attempt to render in the lan-

guage of everyday life the non-classical Greek of the original. The translators say in their Preface: "This translation of the New Testament is an endeavor to do for the English nation what has been done already for the people of almost all other countries—to enable Englishmen to read the most important part of their Bible in that form of their own language which they themselves use. It had its origin in the recognition of the fact that the English of the Authorized Version (closely followed in that of the Revised Version), though widely valued for its antique charm, is in many passages difficult, or even quite unintelligible, to the modern reader. The retention, too, of a form of English no longer in common use is liable to give the impression that the contents of the Bible have little to do with the life of today. The Greek used by the New Testament writers was not the classical Greek of some centuries earlier, but the form of the language spoken in their own day. Moreover, the writers represent those whose utterances they record as using the words and phrases of everyday life."

To the reader who knows neither Greek nor Elizabethan English this version will often throw light upon much that is dark in the Authorized Version. For instance, in Paul's first letter to Timothy:

"Timothy, guard what has been entrusted to you. Avoid the profane prattle and contradictions of what some miscall 'theology,' for there are those who, while asserting their proficiency in it, have yet, as regards the Faith, gone altogether astray."

The Authorized Version reads:

"O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called."

Only last summer, I said to a friend with whom I was camping out, that well-ascertained truths of science made it impossible for me to accept his interpretation of certain passages of Scripture. Without the slightest suspicion of incongruity, he turned upon me with this quotation about "science falsely so called," as if in the time of King James there was any such thing as science in the modern sense. His reply was not to the point, but it well illustrates what old Dr. South called "the fatal imposition of words," and also illustrates the polarity of average thinking. But with all its powerful search-light the Twentieth Century New Testament will hardly take high rank as literature.

The lack of a distinct literary touch will seem evident to the average reader on a comparison, for instance, of a familiar passage with that of the Authorized Version:

"That is why I say to you, do not be anxious about your life here—what you can get to eat or drink; nor yet about your body—what you can get to wear. Is not life more than food, and the body than its clothing? Look at the wild birds—they neither sow, nor reap, nor gather into barns; and yet your heavenly Father feeds them! And are not you more precious than they? But which of you, by being anxious, can prolong his life a single moment? And why be anxious about clothing? Study the wild lilies, and how they grow. They neither toil nor spin; yet I tell you that even Solomon in all his splendour was not robed like one of these. If God so clothes even the grass of the field, which is living today and tomorrow will be thrown into the oven, will he not much more clothe you, O men of little faith? Do not then ask anxiously, 'What can we get to eat?' or 'What can we get to wear?' All these are the things for which the nations are seeking, and your heavenly Father knows that you need them all. But first seek his Kingdom and the righteousness that he requires, and then all these things shall be added for you. Therefore do not be anxious about tomorrow, for tomorrow will bring its own anxieties. Every day has trouble enough of its own."

The Authorized Version of 1611 is a revision of successive versions that preceded it: the Bishops' Bible, the Genevan, the Great Bible (1538), the first English translation of Scripture by government authority, Matthew's Bible (1537), Coverdale's (1535), all of which are revisions based on Tindale's Version, whose New Testament, printed at Worms in 1525, laid the foundation for the Authorized Version. Tindale's version was the first independent translation in English from the Greek and Hebrew of the original. A complete translation of the Bible from the Latin Vulgate of Jerome (*Editio Vulgata*) had been made by Wyclif, a contemporary of Chaucer, in 1380, but the Wyclif version seems to have had little or no influence on Tindale's version. In his first edition of the New Testament Tindale declares:

"I had no man to counterfet, nether was holpe with englysshe of eny that had interpreted the same, or such lyke thinge in the scripture before tyme."

Tindale's familiarity, however, with the sonorous Latin of the Vulgate must have had some unconscious influence on the style of his translation, in the same way that familiarity with the rhythmic language of the Authorized Version has influenced the style

of English writers since that time. His great learning—all that Oxford and Cambridge then afforded—his overmastering zeal, his heroic character, and his poetic temperament, or sensitiveness to rhythm, all combined to single him out as the one man of the age best fitted for the noble task to which he devoted his life; and when we realize that it was his work that made possible the Authorized Version, we find another illustration of Emerson's well-known saying, "An institution is but the lengthened shadow of one man."

A comparison of Tindale's version with the Authorized Version will show the indebtedness of the latter both in form and spirit. For example, take Tindale's rendering of the parable of the prodigal son:

"And he sayde: a certayne man had two sonnes, and the yonger of them sayde to his father: father, geve me my parte of the goodes that to me belongeth. And he devided unto them his substaunce. And not longe after, the yonger sonne gaddered all that he had togedder, and toke his iorney into a farre countre, and there he wasted his goodes with royetous lyvinge. And when he had spent all that he had, ther rose a greate derth thorow out all that same londe, and he began to lacke. And he went and clave to a citesyn of that same countre, which sent him to his felde, to kepe his swyne. And he wold fayne have filled his bely with the coddess that the swyne ate; and no man gave him.

"Then he came to him selfe and sayde: how many hyred servauntes at my fathers have breed ynough, and I dye for hunger. I will aryse, and goo to my father and will saye unto him: father, I have synned agaynst heven and before the, and am no moare worthy to be called thy sonne, make me as one of thy hyred servauntes. And he arose and went to his father. And when he was yet a greate waye of, his father sawe him and had compassion, and ran and fell on his necke, and kyssed him. And the sonne sayd unto him: father, I have synned agaynst heven, and in thy sight, and am no moare worthy to be called thy sonne. But his father sayde to his servauntes: bringe forth that best garment and put it on him, and put a ryng on his honde, and shewes on his fete. And bringe hider that fatted caulfe, and kyll him, and let us eate and be mery; for this my sonne was deed, and is alyve agayne, he was loste, and is now founde. And they began to be merye."

The intensity of feeling on the part of the translators of the Authorized Version, reflected in the language, we may readily account for when we recall that religious belief was not then, as now, a dilettante affair, but a matter of life and death. Many a man who had witnessed in youth the martyrdom of Tindale and

John Rogers, the editor of Matthew's Bible, and later in life the persecution of the Geneva exiles, might have lived to read in his old age the Authorized Version of 1611. It is a sad reflection that after fifteen centuries of Christianity the persecution and death at the stake of the early translators by their fellow Christians rivaled in cruelty and bitterness the persecution of the original writers of the New Testament by the pagan world. This intensity of feeling explains, in part, why the reading of the Bible lifts one above the petty concerns of daily life which, for a time, at least, seem trivial and insignificant. "Much reading of the Bible," Professor Gardiner well says, "will soon bring us to an understanding of the mood in which all art seems a juggling with trifles, and an attempt to catch the unessential when the everlasting verities are slipping by."^{*}

It is a fortunate thing for English prose that we have in the Authorized Version a translation made at the time when the language was at the height of its vigor. No other prose work in English literature has such a large proportion of Saxon words, and it is the Saxon words that make for strength. The learned abstract terms derived from the Latin, in which the language of literature abounds today, had not then become a familiar part of our speech, or, in case of some, were rejected as unfit to express strong feeling. Even the idiomatic prose of Defoe or of Bunyan far exceeds the Authorized Version in the use of the Latin element of our speech. Professor Gardiner has pointed out that many words which appear only once in the Bible are such common words as: *amiable, commodious, conquer, constraint, debase, discipline, disgrace, enable, intelligence, modest, quantity, reformation, severity, transferred*.[†]

I have nowhere seen a more striking illustration of the majesty of plainness and simplicity than in Chateaubriand's comparison between the style of the Bible and that of Homer: Ruth thus addresses Naomi: "Intreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following after thee; for whither thou goest I will go; and where thou lodgest I will lodge; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God; where thou diest will I die, and there will I be buried." Let us try to render this verse into the language of

^{*}*The Bible as English Literature*, p. 383.

[†]*Ibid.*, p. 368.

Homer: "The fair Ruth thus responds to the wise Naomi, honored by the people as a goddess: 'Cease to oppose the determination with which a divinity inspires me; I will tell thee the truth, just as it is, and without disguise. I am resolved to follow thee. I will remain with thee, whether thou shalt continue to reside among the Moabites, so dexterous in throwing the javelin, or shalt return to Judea, so fertile in olives. With thee I will demand hospitality of the nations who respect the suppliant. Our ashes shall be mingled in the same urn, and I will offer agreeable sacrifices to the God who incessantly accompanies thee,' she said; and as when the vehement West Wind brings a warm, refreshing rain, the husbandmen prepare the wheat and the barley, and make baskets of rushes nicely interwoven, for they foresee that the falling shower will soften the soil and render it fit for receiving the precious gifts of Ceres; so the words of Ruth, like a fertilizing rain, melted the heart of Naomi."*

Good prose is always rhythmical; there is a musical coördination of words—what Sidney Lanier calls "phonetic syzygy"—in prose at its best. But the measures are more complicated, they are not reducible to any metrical system, cannot be scanned. Now if there is any one quality of style that differentiates the prose of the Authorized Version from any other English prose, it is this musical quality of rhythm, which must appeal to every ear. The barrier between prose and verse seems to have been burnt away by the glowing faith and sustained enthusiasm of the translators. Examples of perfect metrical lines have frequently been pointed out. I know of no better hexameter line in English poetry than this:

"God is gone up with a shout, the Lord with the sound of a trumpet."
—Ps. 47, 5.

Even in the more prosaic Epistles:

"Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them."
—Col. 3, 19,

with which compare a line from *Evangeline*:

"Homeward serenely she walked with God's benediction upon her."

Other examples of the hexameter are:

**Genie du Christianisme*: Part II., Bk. 5, Chaps. 3, 4. From Cook's *The Bible and English Prose Style*.

"How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning?"—Is. 14, 12.

"Is it time for you, O ye, to dwell in your ceiled houses?"—Hag. 1, 4.

"And the doors shall be shut in the streets, when the sound of the grinding is low."—Ecc. 12, 4,

is the exact metre of Cowper's *Alexander Selkirk*:

"I am out of humanity's reach,
I must finish my journey alone."

And Tennyson, with a slight change, can insert a verse in *The May Queen*:

"And the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest."

There would seem to be no better way to cultivate the ear in the melodies of prose than by habitual reading of the Authorized Version. Frederic Harrison, in his essay on "Ruskin as Master of Prose," says: "Of all the masters of prose literature John Ruskin has made the finest use of this resource ("musical assonance"), and with the most delicate and mysterious power. And this is no doubt due to his mind being saturated with the harmonies of our English Bible, and to his speaking to us with religious solemnity and in Biblical tones."

To one whose ear has become sensitive to Biblical rhythm the difference in effect between "The rich he hath sent empty away" and "He hath sent the rich away empty," is the difference between reclining in a Pullman car over a road-bed of rock, and sitting upright on the bare board of a wagon without springs over rough and frozen ground.

Saintsbury, in the Introduction to his "Specimens of English Prose Style," says: "I know no more perfect example of English prose rhythm than the famous verses of the last chapter of the Canticles in the Authorized Version; I am not certain that I know any so perfect. Here they are arranged for the purpose of exhibition in clause lines:

'Set me as a seal upon thine heart, as a seal upon thine arm:
For love is strong as death; jealousy is cruel as the grave:
The coals thereof are coals of fire, which hath a most vehement flame.
Many waters cannot quench love, neither can the floods drown it:
If a man should give all the substance of his house for love,
It would utterly be contemned.'"

To my ear the passage in *Isaiah*, 52, 7, is even more rhythmical; it sings itself:

"How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings; that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation; that sayeth unto Zion, Thy God reigneth! Thy watchmen shall lift up the voice; with the voice together shall they sing: for they shall see eye to eye, when the Lord shall bring again Zion.

Break forth into joy, sing together ye waste places of Jerusalem; for the Lord hath comforted his people, he hath redeemed Jerusalem.

The Lord hath made bare his holy arm in the eyes of all the nations; and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God."

The language of the Authorized Version is so deeply interwoven with the literature of the English people that familiarity with the Bible becomes as much a matter of necessity to the student of literature as a knowledge of classical mythology, which is more generally conceded to be indispensable. A teacher of English in Yale University, in the preface to his recent school edition of Ruskin, says, in explanation of the character of the notes: "In the case of literary allusions, the more obvious are not noticed; a student is rightly offended at being informed that Achilles is the hero of Homer's *Iliad*. On the contrary, even the most obvious of Ruskin's many Biblical allusions are explained, since the editor has found that such explanation is, unfortunately, necessary." So, taking for granted the student needs no note on Achilles, he gives four lines to an explanation of "the Good Samaritan."

No college teacher of English will presume too far upon his students' knowledge of the English Bible. Perhaps not more than one out of ten can be counted on to recognize any Biblical allusion except the most obvious. It seems strange, in view of the widespread ignorance of the Bible on the part of college students of the present day, and the many Biblical allusions throughout English literature, that any department of English should omit a course on the English Bible. Professor Gardiner's charming book, "The Bible as English Literature" (1906)—to which I have frequently referred in this article, and to which I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness—is the outcome of such a course at Harvard University, and supplies a suitable text-book for classes pursuing this study of vital interest to all students of literature. Is not the book of *Psalms* as much a part of English literature as, for instance, Cowper's *Olney Hymns*, or the book of *Job* as worthy

of study as Milton's *Samson Agonistes*? If these are not literature, what is? And, if the Bible is not literature, where deep call-eth unto deep, what is it?

[NOTE.—After this article was written and in the hands of the editors I received a copy of Professor Moulton's new book, *The Modern Reader's Bible*, in one volume (The Macmillan Co.). The tone of the preface is that of one having authority, and I should gladly have made quotations from it, if the book had come to hand a little earlier. There is one passage, however, that bears so directly and forcibly on the point I tried to make in the closing paragraph of my article, I cannot deny myself the pleasure of bringing it before the eyes of the reader:

"Yet, if the question be of study, what field has greater claims than this literature of the Bible? Our academic traditions have long recognized in the classical literature a sufficient instrument of culture. But when the content of the Bible is allowed to appear in its full literary form, Hebraic classics will be recognized as not inferior to Hellenic. If the inimitable freshness of primitive life is preserved in Homer, it is not less preserved in the epic stories of the Old Testament; while the still more intangible simplicity of the idyl is found perfect in *Ruth* and *Tobit*, and far more attractive than the artificiality of Theocritus. The orations of *Deuteronomy* are as noble models as the orations of Cicero. Read by the side of the poetry of the psalms, the lyrics of Pindar seem almost provincial."

For the literary study of the Bible in literary form this new edition of *The Modern Reader's Bible* is indispensable and not likely to be superseded in our day.—E. A. A.]

France in North Africa

By GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER

Professor of History in Wesleyan University

III. BUGEAUD AND THE CONQUEST OF ALGERIA.

Exactly seven years to a day elapsed between Bugeaud's landing at Algiers and the overthrow of Louis Philippe in 1848. These were the years of French triumph in Algeria—seven full years after eleven lean ones. The protagonists in this seven years' struggle had already met on this same field of action, and are already known to the reader, but it may be worth while to present pen portraits of them, drawn by men who were intimately acquainted with Abd-el-Kader and Bugeaud.

That curious adventurer, Léon Roches, who lived with the emir during the two years of peace between 1837 and 1839, and who later rendered invaluable services as the Arabic interpreter for Bugeaud, wrote in 1837 the following description of Abd-el-Kader: "His complexion is fair, of a dull white; his forehead large and high; narrow black eyebrows, much arched, over two large blue eyes fringed with black lashes, and full of moisture that gives the eye so much brilliancy and softness. His nose is well made and slightly aquiline, his lips thin but not pinched, his beard black, full, without being thick, short and ending in a point, his face oval. A little tattoo mark between the two eyebrows blemishes the fairness of his forehead, his hands are small and thin, and remarkably white, one of them is almost always resting on his foot, which is not the least inferior to it in its proportions or whiteness; his stature is not above five feet and some lines, but he is strongly built. Some turns of a small cord of camel's hair fixing a haik of fine white wool upon his head, a cotton shirt, a tunic of the same stuff, a white burnous and a brown burnous, this is all his dress. He always holds a little black rosary in his right hand, and is rapidly telling over the beads; when he listens, his mouth is always pronouncing the words of prayers applicable to the occasion. If an artist wanted to paint one of the monks of the middle ages, who were animated by sublime ideas of religion, and by the courage that often made them take up arms for

the defense of that religion, he could not find a better model. . . . He is educated; he is merciful, though Muhammadan policy sometimes compels him to have recourse to bloody executions; he has stirred up the Arabs in the name of religion, that powerful motive that shakes empires; he wishes to bring the Muhammadians back to Muhammad's institutions, his government to the old form of the government of the kalifs, the conquerors of Africa. His code and his charter is the Koran. Do you want an idea of his policy? Listen. He increases his treasure with the arrears of taxes that he has paid up by the tribes that remained under him. He recruits his army of foot and horse; he calls all his auxiliaries friends; and goes with them to punish the tribes of the kabla (south). His first success decides in his favor all that are wavering; and makes all that have revolted submit through fear. Some he generously pardons; others are punished with death; some receive gifts; others are drawn by the attractions of ambition. The further he goes the more formidable become his forces; six months have hardly elapsed since the treaty of the Tafna [Bugeaud's treaty]; and here his dominion is recognized from the frontiers of Morocco to the frontiers of the province of Constantine."

A thoroughly competent characterization of Bugeaud is given by the historian Guizot, one of the chiefs of the ministry which appointed him to the Algerian command, in writing of that nomination in his *Memoirs*: "General Bugeaud was not an officer to whom it was possible to give such or such instructions, with the certainty that he would limit his ambition to executing them as best he could, and making his way in his career by pleasing his chiefs. He was a man of an original and independent mind, a fruitful and fervid imagination, an ardent will that thought for itself, and took a great deal of room for its own thoughts, while serving the power from which he held his mission. Neither education nor study had tamed his powerful character, while they developed it. Early thrown among the stern trials of military life, and too late into the complicated scenes of political life, he had formed himself by his observations alone and his own experience, according to the instincts of a strong good-sense, that was sometimes deficient in proportion and tact, never in justice or power. In everything, in especial the war and affairs in Algeria, he had his own special views, his plans, his resolutions; and not only did he

pursue them in deed, but proclaimed them beforehand on every occasion, to all comers, in his conversations and his correspondence, with a force of conviction and a warmth of speech that increased more and more in proportion to the contradiction and doubt he encountered. He thus committed himself in his eagerness, both as regards himself and those who did not entirely accept his views, and was so full of his own decided judgment and his patriotic intentions, that he did not perceive the prejudices aroused by the intemperance of language, or foresee the difficulties that these pretensions would sow around his steps when he had to act, after so much talk."

General Bugeaud's previous relations to Algeria had been both military and political. The military policies which he had inaugurated so successfully in his brief campaigns on the Tafna foreshadowed the methods which he was to push with such vigor and effectiveness as governor general. As a politician, however, Bugeaud had been most outspoken in his opposition to the retention of Algeria, and had advocated with vigor the narrowing of French activities in that desert and worthless country, as he had considered it. This attitude he abandoned completely when he accepted the appointment as governor general; not that he had changed his opinions, but that he had accepted as his own the forward policy of the ministry. Henceforth his political actions concerning Algeria were as vigorous and as effective as his military policy.

The sole and immediate aim of his policy was the complete conquest and pacification of Algeria and the effective establishment of French control throughout the country. His military policy was to apply to the situation in Algeria the methods of guerilla fighting which he had learned in Spain, improving them by what he could learn from his Arab foemen. Artillery and transport were limited as much as possible; the cavalry was increased; and both cavalry and infantry were taught to march with the smallest possible amount of impedimenta and to live off the country. Long, rapid marches, sudden blows, and obstinate fighting by hardened young veterans who were perfectly fit, replaced the policy of holding forts and block-houses where inaction and pestiferous conditions unnerved and decimated the troops, and drunkenness and vice ruined the remnant. The campaign of 1841 in Algeria was not marked by great battles or brilliant fighting, but was

remarkable for its strategy and its unqualified success. In method and effectiveness the campaign of 1841 in Algeria deserves to be compared with Bonaparte's famous campaign of 1796 in Italy, though the amount of actual fighting was insignificant in comparison. Abd-el-Kader was always on the defensive and relied continually upon his usual Fabian policy.

Landing at Algiers on February 23, 1841, Bugeaud at once proclaimed his policy both to the colonists and to the soldiers; and officers who were not disposed to act in perfect obedience and full sympathy with him were given to understand that their services were no longer needed in Algeria. To the colonists he announced the new policy and avowed his own complete adherence to it: "My voice was not sufficiently powerful to stop an impulse that is perhaps the work of destiny. The country has committed itself; I must follow it. I have accepted the grand and beautiful mission of assisting in the accomplishment of its work, and I consecrate to it for the future all the activity, devotion, and resolution that nature has given me. The Arabs must be conquered; the standard of France must be the only one raised on this African land. But the war now indispensable is not the object. The conquest will be barren without colonization. I shall therefore be an ardent colonizer, for I think there is less glory in gaining battles than in founding something of permanent utility for France." In a similar tone he addressed the troops: "You have often conquered the Arabs; you will conquer them again; but it is a trifle to make them fly: they must be made to submit. . . . The coming campaign again summons you to display to France the soldierly virtues she is so proud of. I shall call upon your ardor, your devotion to the country and the king, for all that is requisite to attain the object, and no more. I shall be careful to spare your strength and health. I am sure the officers of every rank and the sub-officers will support me. They never will neglect an opportunity of relieving the troops from some moments of fatigue, or of giving such moral encouragements as the circumstances may require. . . . Soldiers! on other occasions I have been able to gain the confidence of several corps of the African army; I am proud to believe that this feeling will soon be general, because I am resolved to do everything to deserve it. Without confidence in the chief, moral force, the first condition of success, cannot exist. Have

confidence, therefore, in me, as France and your general have confidence in you."

Bugeaud's care for his men enabled him to get a tremendous amount of work out of them, and they toiled and fought willingly for Bugeaud, who commanded not only their fullest confidence, but also their enthusiastic sympathy and unwavering support. This loyalty of the army was a welcome contrast to the virulent attacks of the French press and politicians, whose bitter and unjustified attacks constantly fretted Bugeaud, and to the attitude of the government which often seemed irritating and unappreciative.

After a hurried inspection of Algiers and Blida, Bugeaud hastened to the province of Constantine, where he visited every post from Bona to Bougie, and left orders to place the province completely on the defensive, for he intended to carry on his campaigns in the provinces of Algiers and Oran. General Négrier was left in command at Constantine, and General Lafontaine at Philippeville, and small detachments were maintained at Bona, Bougie, Djidjilli, Guelma and Setif. Back at Algiers on March 18, he hastened the plans for the campaign. All portions of Algeria occupied by French troops were declared in a state of war. The African militia was called out. Transport animals were requisitioned. Trade with tribes not at peace with France was forbidden. It was announced that the submission of individual natives would not be accepted, but only the submission of chiefs for their tribes. Arabs living within the French lines were required to wear metal badges inscribed, "Arab subject." Colonists were forbidden to use firearms for sporting purposes, in order to avoid needless alarms. On March 30 Bugeaud set out for a two weeks' campaign, in which he visited Blida and revictualled Medea and fought several skirmishes with El Barkani, the chief lieutenant of the emir. The actual territory covered and fighting done amounted to but little, but the moral effect of the campaign was remarkable. It showed both sides that a new hand was in control and that the French campaign was to be pushed with a vigor, decision, and wisdom hitherto unknown. The French were stimulated, the Arabs depressed. Experienced Algerian campaigners like Changarnier, Cavaignac, Duvivier, and the Duc d'Aumale found full scope for their abilities and enthusiasm under the leadership of a competent

and appreciative commander. A second campaign of less than a fortnight's duration opened on April 26, in which Medea was again the objective. The Duc de Nemours and Baraguey d'Hilliers commanded the two divisions, and many a future general or marshal of France, like Saint-Arnaud, won laurels in the running fight with Abd-el-Kader in the valley of the upper Chelif. The command in Algiers was left to Baraguey d'Hilliers, who had served under Napoleon, and who was to win the baton of marshal of France in the Baltic expedition during the Crimean war and to be one of the victorious commanders in the Italian campaign of 1859.

Landing at Mostaganem on May 15, Bugeaud speedily opened the third campaign. Lamoricière came up from Oran with a considerable force, and three days later the march southward was begun. The objective was Tagdemt, the chief arsenal of Abd-el-Kader. The place was reached on May 25. The emir had destroyed much, and Bugeaud finished the work of destruction. Constantly harassed by Abd-el-Kader, he reached Mascara on May 30, and Mostaganem on June 3. The total loss during the eighteen days was twenty killed and eighty-five wounded. The damage to the emir was irreparable, and his loss of prestige serious. From June 7 to June 27 the fourth campaign was made with Mascara as the objective. Most of the time was spent, not in the usual procedure of burning the harvests, but of reaping them and storing the crops in Mascara. The damage to the Arabs was no less and the gain to the French all-important. Incidentally a friendly Arab was installed as bey of Mascara. While Bugeaud went to Algiers and returned to Mostaganem, the fifth campaign—the third to Mascara—was made by Lamoricière during the first two weeks of July. The double object of provisioning the town and harassing the Arabs was admirably effected by these three campaigns. The tables had been completely turned on the Arabs, who were now the hunted.

Meanwhile Baraguey d'Hilliers had been carrying out the sixth campaign of the year, being absent from Blida from May 18 to June 2, during which time he provisioned Medea and Miliana, and destroyed the Arab posts of Boghar and Thaza. Though not a life was lost and but few wounded, this was the most completely successful campaign yet fought in Algeria. The whole middle valley of the Chelif was now in French control.

The seventh and longest campaign of the year 1841 lasted from September 18 to November 5. Once more Mostaganem was the base. Mascara was again provisioned; the Guetna of Sidi-Mahied-din, with the paternal seat of the emir, was destroyed; and then the force pressed on to Saïda only to find that the emir had already partially destroyed the place. The campaigns of Tagdemt and Saïda in the province of Oran and the campaign of Boghar and Thaza in the province of Algiers struck mortal blows at the power of Abd-el-Kader. The year 1841 is the great year of the conquest of Algeria. The remainder is only the aftermath of the real struggle. This one year with its seven campaigns had accomplished more than the preceding eleven years. When the year began, the French seemingly existed in Algeria on sufferance; at its close they were masters of the situation. One political stroke of vital significance was delivered when Bugeaud sent his adventurous interpreter, Léon Roches, to Mecca, whence he brought back a sort of religious edict which proclaimed that a Muhammadan might tolerate a truce when the infidel invader leaves to the Muhammadan his wives, his children, his faith, and the practice of his religion. It will be readily understood how important was the influence of this document in securing the submission of the Arabs to the French rule. Bugeaud, also, had engraved on his seal the Arabic inscription from the Koran, "The earth is the Lord's, and he gives it in heritage to those whom he has chosen."

While it is possible to select some seven important movements or campaigns in the year 1841, these formed only one phase of the grand plan of operations. The other was that, in both the provinces of Algiers and of Oran, the troops were kept in constant activity in conducting the so-called *razzias* against the natives. These raids were a most effective feature of the campaign, and their apparent harshness and cruelty aroused vigorous remonstrances in France. Bugeaud defended them in these words: ". . . War is made and nations compelled to capitulate by seizing upon these great interests. . . . The agricultural interest, though neglected in Europe, is the only one that can be injured in Africa; it is harder to get hold of in Africa than anywhere else, for there are no farms or villages among the Arabs. This people live in their tents, and all their movable wealth can be placed on the beasts of burden that they possess. . . . As soon as our

columns moved there was desolation before us, the villagers mounted upon camels, mules, and bullocks and fled away with their wives and children. There was nothing left for us to make war upon but the harvests at their ripening. . . . It took us a long time to find out how to reach these fugitive populations, but at last we have managed it, and from that moment you might see the progress of pacification. It is therefore to the *razzia*, at which you shudder, that we owe all our progress." Not only in the year 1841, but even more in the succeeding years, the *razzias* offered the chief employment to the troops. It is perhaps worth while to note the actual numbers of the French forces in Algeria at various dates. The number had been 17,900 in 1831; 31,000 in 1834; 42,000 in 1837; 63,000 in 1840; on July 1, 1841, the number was 78,900; and on the same date in succeeding years, 83,281 in 1842; 85,664 in 1843, and 90,562 in 1844.

The winter months of 1842 seemed likely to witness the end of Bugeaud's administration and his supersession by General Count de Rumigny, an intimate of Louis Philippe, who had come out to take command of the province of Algiers. The affair passed over and Rumigny soon returned to France. Meanwhile Bugeaud had been off to Oran during the month of February and had reoccupied Tlemcen, which had been abandoned by his treaty of the Tafna in 1837, and also advanced to Sebdou, some distance further south. The other two important operations of the year 1842 were the campaign of the Chelif and the campaign of the Ouarensenis. The river Chelif rises nearly south of Mostaganem and far in the interior. It is compelled to flow many miles to the eastward to break through the mountain range of the Ouarensenis, which it does between Boghar and Miliana. It then is blocked from the sea by the range of the Dahra, and so flows westward between the Ouarensenis and the Dahra till it finds an outlet just east of Mostaganem, after a course of 350 miles. It is the longest river of Algeria, and the valley just described is the most important river plain of the country. On April 25 Bugeaud left Algiers, landed at Oran, took command of the troops there and marched them up the Chelif till he was met near Miliana by the Algiers troops under General de Bar, who was in command of that province. Then he marched back to Oran and returned to Algiers on June 11. This was the first time that operations had been car-

ried out in combination by the two provinces, and the first time this region had been entirely traversed by French troops. The moral effect was great, but the hostile tribes had simply retired into the defiles of the Ouarensenis.

The four months of the summer were marked by no single important action; but a highroad to Medea, which would avoid the dangerous passage of the col of Mouzaïa, was constructed; no less than nine new towns of colonists were settled near Algiers; the last hostile tribe of the Mitidja, the region adjacent to Algiers, was brought to submission. The first fortnight of October was occupied with the subjugation of the hostile tribes immediately to the east of Algiers in the valley of the Sebaou. It was not until November 22 that Bugeaud set out from Blida for his campaign in the Ouarensenis. Lamoricière was called upon to coöperate from Oran. Changarnier and other experienced lieutenants bore the brunt of the fighting, which was of the warmest sort, for Abd-el-Kader had hastened up to prevent such an overwhelming disaster to his interests as French success in this campaign would be. On December 16 the Arabs were caught in the net and forced to beg for terms. Bugeaud treated them generously and only exacted the promise of submission, not even retaining a single hostage. On the return march Changarnier was ordered to make an effort to reach the coast and seize Tenes, but in this he failed. Bugeaud was back at Algiers on December 30. The three main campaigns, the Tlemcen, the Chelif and the Ouarensenis, of the year 1842, had resulted in a large extension of the French sphere of influence and operations, and had damaged the prestige of Abd-el-Kader beyond recovery.

To retrieve his fortunes the emir labored desperately during the opening months of 1843. A brilliant dash into the valley of the Chelif was made in January and February to offset the campaign of Bugeaud in the Ouarensenis and the operations of Saint Arnaud in the same country at that moment. Letters and emissaries warned every native chieftain that the French would not long be able to maintain their position, and urged them to return to their allegiance to the Arab cause. Not only Saint-Arnaud, but also Lamoricière in Oran, the Duc d'Aumale in the old province of Titteri, and Changarnier on the confines of Algeria kept up the razzias and gave the enemy and the hostile tribes no rest. Bugeaud

busied himself with a large scheme which was to consolidate his control of the valley of the Chelif, through which he had campaigned in the previous year. His idea involved Tenes on the coast. In spite of the control of the sea, the difficulties of access to the place by land made it necessary to try four times before he could finally occupy the town. This was to be simply a port of entry for the main headquarters for the valley, which he intended to establish at a suitable point on the river, directly back from Tenes. On April 17, 1843, after careful planning, Bugeaud set out from Algiers and on the 26th was at the junction of the Tigraouet with the Chelif, at the site of a ruined Roman town, which the Arabs called El Esnam. Here the new town was founded and the garrison established under the command of Cavaignac. Then the governor general set out to build a road over the mountains of the Dahra to Tenes. He reached his objective on his fourth trial, and within a few days had the road completed in spite of the enormous difficulties, and on May 9 he conducted the first transport over the new road from Tenes to El Esnam, which was christened Orleansville. The occupation of Tenes and the establishment of Orleansville were followed by constant raids into the Dahra and the Ouarensenis to subjugate the various tribes.

Bugeaud, having completed this important achievement, began to plan a new series of combinations destined to have far-reaching results. Under his directions the Duc d'Aumale, Lamoricière and General Bedeau were kept constantly marching and counter-marching in what seemed to them an entirely aimless procedure. This was done to confuse the emir and to conceal the real plan of the campaign, which the governor general kept to himself. At the right moment the young prince and Lamoricière were pushed far into the interior back of the Ouarensenis. The objective was the smalah, or movable headquarters, of the emir. Suddenly the Duc d'Aumale, whose total force numbered only two thousand, found himself close on the track of the smalah, and to his complete surprise suddenly came upon it at Taguin on the upper Chelif, when he had only five hundred cavalry with him. The smalah was just making its encampment and failed to observe the enemy's approach. It was a moment for immediate action or the most hasty retreat. The young prince lost no time in deciding for immediate attack. So five hundred men rode down upon the mass

of 20,000 souls, including 5,000 musketeers. The surprise was complete and the rout disastrous. Flight saved many, but 300 slain were left upon the field; 4,000 prisoners, including the families of many of his chieftains and numerous illustrious personages, the emir's treasure, tents, and standards fell into the hands of the victor. The affair was over in an hour, and the French had lost only nine killed and twelve wounded. The fight had scarcely ended when the 1,300 French infantry arrived after a march of thirty leagues in thirty-six hours, through an unknown and almost desert country. Lamoricière, who had advanced to Tiaret, caught many of the fugitives. Abd-el-Kader did not hear of the disaster until three days later, so that the Duc d'Aumale was able to effect his withdrawal without any interference and to carry off all his prisoners and booty. On July 19 he was promoted to lieutenant general and on July 31 Bugeaud received the coveted marshal's baton. Changarnier and Lamoricière had already received their lieutenant general's commissions in April. The capture of the *smalah* was the last great event in the conquest of Algeria. The power of Abd-el-Kader was gone and only a few faithful followers clung to him as he retreated into the restless districts along the Moroccan border. His attempts again to rally southern Oran to his standard were checked by Lamoricière and a final blow was struck by General Tempoure on the Oued Malah, or Salt river, on December 11, 1843, when the most important of Abd-el-Kader's lieutenants, Ben-Allal-Ouled-Sidi-Embarek, the former bey of Miliana, was defeated and slain.

Negotiations were opened through Léon Roches for the surrender of the emir and his withdrawal to Mecca or some other place in the East. Abd-el-Kader refused to submit, and, after taking some steps to place the Sultan of Morocco under obligation to him, entered Moroccan territory. After the capture of the *smalah*, the Duc d'Aumale had spent a short time in France. On his return he was appointed governor of Constantine, as a step to his promotion to the governor generalship. He soon pushed an expedition far to the southward into the oasis of Biskra, where he won a fight on March 15, 1844, losing only six killed and sixteen wounded. Among the latter was the Duc de Montpensier, the youngest son of Louis Philippe. In May, 1844, Bugeaud pushed another expedition into the coast region between Algiers and

Bougie, occupying Dellys, near the mouth of the Sebaou, and secured the submission of the neighboring tribes. An expedition of 2,800 men under General Marey-Monge, was sent due southward from Algiers 250 miles to the oasis of El Aghouat. The expedition even penetrated beyond El Aghouat to the edge of the great desert, reaching a more distant point than had ever been visited by the Turks. Thus were the last steps toward the completion of the conquest of Algeria being taken, when news from Oran suddenly called Bugeaud to attend to the new conditions which had arisen from Abd-el-Kader's intrigues in Morocco.

Between February, 1841, and May, 1844, Bugeaud had effected the French conquest of Algeria by completely breaking the power of Abd-el-Kader and driving him to take refuge in Morocco. It remained to compel the other powers in Africa and the nations of Europe to recognize and respect the French occupation; to effect gradually the pacification of the less accessible and the more remote districts; and to cement the French control.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

An Unpublished Poem of Timrod

BY JAMES E. ROUTH, JR.

Professor of English in Washington University, Missouri

A few years ago (January, 1903,) there appeared in the *SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY* a short article by the present writer entitled "Some Fugitive Poems of Timrod." In this were presented three poems of Timrod published during his lifetime in newspapers, but entirely overlooked by the compilers of the modern "complete" edition of his poetry, and apparently forgotten by the world. To these three forgotten poems the present article will add a fourth, discovered in the same collection of papers. The fourth, however, differs from the other three in the circumstances of its preservation, as it is in manuscript form, and, so far as the present writer can determine, has at no time been printed. In literary value the newly found poem is inferior to the best poems of Timrod, but is none the less—like all the scanty remains of that shy genius—worth preserving.

In the previous article in the *SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY* the source of the poems printed was described as the scrap-book of "a Virginia lady." The scrap-book is but a single item in a large collection of papers. By the kindness of the collector's daughters, in whose possession the papers remain, I am permitted to supplement that meagre allusion by a specific identification of the collection, such as the critic or antiquarian may demand. The collector was the late Mrs. Loughton, of Petersburg, Virginia, a granddaughter of Patrick Henry and wife of Octave Loughton, a brother of the New Hampshire poet, Albert Loughton. The collection comprises, besides clippings from newspapers and journals, a large number of autograph letters, among which are specimens of the handwriting of Thackeray, of Poe, of Longfellow, and in fact of a majority of the American and of some English men of letters of the forties and fifties. Some of the autographs are "collected" material; but many more—and these are generally the most valuable for purposes of research—are in the form of correspondence addressed to Mrs. Loughton.

But to turn to the poem itself. The identification of it as one

of Timrod's was made by Mrs. Loughton's daughters, who have put the poem into my hands for publication. The identification is as follows: In Mrs. Loughton's collection are two letters of Paul Hamilton Hayne which are to our present purpose. In one, an extract from which was included in the previous article in the *SOUTH ATLANTIC*, Hayne expresses a wish that Mrs. Loughton write to Timrod, and make his acquaintance. In the other he speaks of sending Mrs. Loughton certain poems to read. Whether Hayne sent any of Timrod's is uncertain, but in the collection of manuscripts are five well known Timrod poems: of these, two are on a half-sheet of note paper; another half-sheet of note paper, identical in size, bears a third; and on its back is the unknown poem with the identity of which we are concerned. Now this poem is not only on a sheet with one of Timrod's, but the handwriting of the five Timrod poems, which is neither Mrs. Loughton's nor Hayne's, occurs in only one other place in Mrs. Loughton's manuscript collection. That place is the manuscript of the newly found poem. Whether the handwriting is Timrod's, I have had as yet no means of determining. But this point is not material, as the manuscript versions may well have been made by someone else for transmission, directly or through the agency of Hayne, to Mrs. Loughton.

More important is the style of the poem, which is characteristically Timrod's. The poem, a sonnet, starts with a single exclamatory word of address, a mannerism which suggests Timrod at once. (Cf. the sonnet—"Complete" Edition, p. 168—which begins,

"Poet! if on a lasting fame be bent
Thy unperturbing hopes;"

and the sonnet printed in the previous article in the *SOUTH ATLANTIC*, which is indisputably Timrod's, as it was printed in a contemporary paper over his famous pen-name, Aglaus,

"Bell! if that old, exploded creed were true
Which made the bright stars arbiters of fate."

Cf. also the first line of *Madeline*, "O lady! if until this hour.") After the exclamation come two lines of pure melody, followed by two lines of vapid conventionality; in the fifth line the poet recovers himself, and, without rising to the height of the first lines, conducts the sonnet safely to a satisfactory end. Now this bril-

liant start, followed by a slump and a subsequent recovery, is also characteristic of Timrod. It is impossible to illustrate the point in a short article; but the reader who has the patience to examine a number of the poet's productions will find the characteristic to be his most noticeable and distinctive defect. Thus the evidence, taken in its entirety, points with almost conclusive force to Timrod as author of the new poem. The poem is as follows:

SONNET.

Lady! I will not wrong thy womanhood,
By crowning thee with praise which is not thine—
I see thee lovely, and I think thee good,
But yet no angel, and not all divine.
For on thy brow, and o'er thy beauteous face—
As manifest in sorrow as in mirth—
There is a most bewitching look of earth,
And all the dearer for the mortal grace.
Aye! thou art earthly, and so tender—meek,
That I might deem much love doth make thee weak—
Did not at times, in some excited hour,
A flash that lights the darkness of thine eyes,
Reveal a secret and a deeper power—
A spirit he has hardihood who tries.

John Randolph's Mission to Russia

By JOHN C. HILDT

Instructor in History in Smith College

Andrew Jackson had long been on friendly terms with John Randolph of Roanoke. When he became president his fondness for Randolph probably caused him to exaggerate Randolph's claims upon him. Randolph had been one of Jackson's active and vehement supporters, and he had doubtless risen in the esteem of the new president by his duel with Henry Clay. Then, too, he was a Virginian, and Virginia was to be conciliated for not receiving representation in the cabinet. With recollections of Randolph's chronic disposition to be always in the opposition, the new president probably thought that his administration would run more smoothly with Randolph out of the country, and he therefore determined to reward him with a foreign mission.

It was not, however, until September 16, 1829, that Jackson wrote to John Randolph offering him the mission to Russia. Jackson's letter was extremely flattering, and the importance of the Russian mission was explained by stating that "the great and rapidly increasing influence of Russia in the affairs of the world render it very important that our representative at that court should be of the highest respectability; and the expediency of such a course at the present moment is greatly increased by circumstances of a special character."^{*}

This offer was apparently unexpected and unsolicited by Randolph. But residence abroad and the possibility of important diplomatic negotiations held out in Jackson's letter seems to have attracted him, and so he accepted the appointment almost immediately.[†]

The appointment of a man with such failings and eccentricities as Randolph to a diplomatic position was indeed extraordinary. The appointment was the more reprehensible because, in order to make room for Randolph, it was necessary to recall Henry Mid-

^{*}Jackson to Randolph, Sept. 16, 1829. Garland's *Life of John Randolph*, vol. 2, pp. 382-3.

[†]Randolph to Jackson, Sept. 24, 1829. *Ibid.*, pp. 383-4.

dleton, who since 1830 successfully occupied the post and whose ability was shown in the negotiation of the treaty of 1824, the first treaty between Russia and the United States.

An important matter had been recently under discussion between the United States and Russia, but the negotiations came to a standstill just before the Russian mission was given to Randolph. Ever since the Revolution the United States had endeavored to negotiate with Russia a treaty on the subject of more favorable neutral rights. All advances, however, were coldly received by Russia. In 1828 Russia declared war against Turkey. Baron Krudener, the Russian minister to the United States, then informed the State Department that his government would apply to neutral merchant vessels leaving Turkish ports the rules laid down in the conventions concluded between Russia and Great Britain in 1801.* By these conventions Russia abandoned the Empress Catherine's armed neutrality and made a compromise with Great Britain whereby Great Britain yielded to the Russian doctrine of blockade and her list of contraband, while Russia conceded the belligerent right of capturing an enemy's property in neutral vessels.

On July 30, 1828, President John Quincy Adams, long familiar with the Russian policy of the United States, expressed to Baron Krudener his wish that Russia should adopt the principles of the armed neutrality in her present war. Thereupon the Russian minister stated that he was authorized to say that his government would receive any proposals which the American government might make for a treaty regulating the rights of neutrals, provided it should be based on principles of reciprocity.† Upon this announcement the State Department formally declared the willingness of the United States to enter into an arrangement with Russia for reviving the principles of the Russian treaties of 1780.‡

Krudener then replied that he would at once inform his government, and took the opportunity to state formally that the Emperor "is disposed to adopt, by mutual agreement with the United States, principles intended, with respect to questions of war and

*Baron Krudener to Secretary of State, July 28, 1828. Russian Legation, vol. 2. MS. State Department.

†J. Q. Adams's Memoirs, vol. 8, pp. 67, 70.

‡See endorsement on the face of the note of Baron Krudener to Secretary of State, July 28, 1828. Russian Legation. MS. State Department.

neutrality, to serve as a reciprocal rule between the two powers, and founded on a desire of granting on both sides the most benevolent terms to their respective navigation."*

When Krudener received further instructions from his government on this subject, Jackson was president and Martin Van Buren was his secretary of state. In an interview on April 4, 1829, Krudener told the new secretary that as soon as Count Nesselrode, the Russian foreign minister, had leisure he would send him instructions to enter upon negotiations with regard to neutral rights. He added that it was probable that the Emperor would form a maritime code with very liberal provisions with regard to neutrals, but that he would not be willing to bind a third party to it.†

In less than a fortnight this subject was resumed. Secretary Van Buren then told the minister that his administration was just as willing as the former one to negotiate a treaty for the protection of neutral rights and freedom of trade whenever he should be empowered to do so. Krudener said that he understood that it was proposed to make a treaty which would amount to an alliance, like the old armed neutrality, to protect neutral trade. Van Buren quickly denied that this was his purpose. He said that the United States merely meant to enter into an agreement with Russia by which the two nations would regulate their mutual relations when at war with other powers.

Krudener seemed satisfied with this, for he expressed the complete willingness of his government to enter into such an agreement, and requested the secretary to make a proposal for such a negotiation. This Van Buren refused to do, saying that the Baron should take the initiative. Krudener replied that he had already done so, but upon his correspondence with the department being examined no such proposal was found. Then the Baron said that he had made it verbally either to President Adams or Mr. Clay. But as he refused to renew the proposal, after some further discussion, "it was at length agreed that both parties were willing to enter upon a convention upon such principles, but as it was not decided how it should commence and as the circumstances in which

*Baron Krudener to Secretary of State, Aug. 16 (28), 1828. Russian Legation, vol. 2. MS. State Department.

†Minutes of a conference with Baron Krudener, April 4, 1829. Russian Legation, vol. 2. MS. State Department.

the countries were placed did not require haste, it should be left as it now is for the present."^{*}

Such was the condition of the negotiations between the United States and Russia, "the circumstances of a special character," as President Jackson wrote, when John Randolph accepted the appointment to Russia. He accepted on September 24, 1829, but it was not until May 25, 1830, that the president sent his nomination to the Senate, where it was immediately confirmed.[†]

If Jackson's administration had broken with most of the diplomatic traditions of preceding administrations, it did not break with their Russian policy. Ever since the Revolution the United States had tried to secure from Russia a commercial treaty and a more favorable recognition of neutral rights. Randolph was now given a "full power to treat of and concerning commerce and navigation generally," and, as the administration expected that negotiations on neutral rights would be shortly taken up again, he was also given a "special power to conclude with His Imperial Majesty a convention on maritime rights." This latter treaty was to establish rules for the conduct of the two countries in respect to the rights and duties of belligerents and neutrals in case either of them should become engaged in war with a third power. It was to be based upon the Empress Catherine's declaration of 1780, and especially was an acknowledgment to be secured for the doctrine that free ships made free all goods except contraband and that there should be freedom of trade with an enemy's ports.[‡]

So sanguine did the administration seem of Randolph's success in his new role that Van Buren wrote him that he wanted to have these affairs with Russia settled, or so far on the way to a settlement as to be able to make an announcement to this effect in the president's next message at the opening of Congress.[§]

In addition Van Buren wrote in Randolph's instructions: "From a suitable respect to what is understood to be the usage at several courts of Europe, requiring the members of the diplomatic

^{*}Minutes of a conference with Baron Krudener, April 16, 1829, made by J. A. Hamilton. Russian Legation, vol. 2. MS. State Department.

[†]Senate Journal, 1st Sess., 21st Cong., pp. 463, 465.

[‡]Van Buren to Randolph, Personal Instructions, June 18, 1830; same to same, General Instructions, June 18, 1830; same to same, Personal Memorandum, June 20, 1830. Ministers' Instructions, vol. 13. MSS. State Department.

[§]Same to same, Personal Memorandum, June 20, 1830. Ibid.

body accredited to them to wear a court dress upon established occasions, such as their presentation to a sovereign or chief executive officers of these governments, respectively, etc., etc., the president has thought proper to adopt the following as the dress to be used by our ministers and other diplomatic agents upon all such occasions, which is recommended as well by its comparative cheapness as its adaptation to the simplicity of our constitution, viz., a black coat with a gold star on each side of the collar near the termination; the underclothes to be black, blue, or white, at the option of the wearer, a three cornered chapeau de bras, a black cockade and eagle, and a steel-mounted sword with a white scabbard. It is to be understood, however, that the use of this particular dress is not prescribed by the president. It is barely suggested by his direction, as an appropriate and conventional uniform dress for the use of our ministers and other diplomatic agents of the United States."* Such a suggestion is scarcely compatible with the present day conception of Jacksonian democracy.

The president was kindness itself to the new minister. He gave Randolph permission to draw upon him in case he could not meet the expenses of his mission,† while the mode of conveyance and the route by which he was to travel to reach his post were left to his discretion. Permission was also readily granted to Randolph that, in case of ill-health, he be allowed to spend the winter in Southern Europe if he could successfully carry out his mission.‡

Randolph left Norfolk on the American sloop-of-war "Concord," June 22, 1830,§ and after stopping in England, arrived at Cronstadt, the port of St. Petersburg, August 9.||

Immediately upon his arrival Randolph began to despair of the success of his mission. Count Nesselrode was at Carlsbad in disgrace, and Prince Lieven, the Russian ambassador at London, whom Randolph suspected of being decidedly pro-British, had charge of the foreign office. Although he was kindly received by Lieven, Randolph at once concluded that it would be impossible for him to accomplish the objects of his mission. The Revolution

*Same to same, Personal Instructions, June 18, 1830. M. S. State Department.

†Jackson to Randolph, June 3, 1830. Jackson MSS. Library of Congress.

‡Randolph to Jackson, June 8, 1830. Ibid. Van Buren to Randolph, June 18, 1830. Ministers' Instructions, vol. 13. MS. State Department.

§Niles's Weekly Register, vol. 39, p. 55.

||Randolph to Van Buren, Aug. 1, Aug. 7 (19), 1830. Dispatches, Russia, vol. 12. MS. State Department.

of 1830 was taking place in France. Therefore Randolph believed that Russia would be unwilling to enter into negotiations with a republican government. To these obstacles Randolph had personal complaints to add. He found that "the water of St. Petersburg is dreadful and breeds all sorts of diseases." Bilious fever of a most malignant type was raging there. His old negro servant, Juba, was taken seriously ill. Randolph himself had an attack of ague. He suspected that his mail had been delayed and opened by the Russian government. He declared that he was not able to write his dispatches, even with spectacles, without being "interrupted every quarter of a minute by innumerable flies, gigantic as the empire they inhabit." Had he not requested an audience with the Emperor, he would have returned on board the "Concord" and left Russia, "the land of Pharoah and his plagues," "Egypt in all but its fertility."*

Randolph was so kindly received by the emperor and the empress that he was thoroughly impressed with their friendliness toward himself and the United States. But as he still believed that he saw no prospect of accomplishing what the president had desired and as he considered himself very sick, he left St. Petersburg on September 19 for England, without taking the customary leave of the emperor, both because he was physically unable and because he expected to return to Russia in May.† Thus Randolph's stay in Russia was six weeks, instead of nine days, as generally stated.‡

Randolph now made London his headquarters, for he declared that there he was as well situated to discharge his official duties as in St. Petersburg.§ He had taken to Russia a young relative, John Randolph Clay, as his secretary of legation. As Clay had been left behind at St. Petersburg, Randolph from London appointed him *chargé d'affaires*.|| Through Clay he now made proposals to the Russian government for a commercial treaty and

*Randolph to Van Buren, Aug. 7 (19), 1830. Dispatches, Russia, vol. 12. MS. State Department; Randolph to Dr. Brockenbrough, Sept. 14, 1830. Garland's Life of John Randolph, vol. 2, pp. 337-8.

†Randolph to Van Buren, Aug. 30 (Sept. 11), Sept. 6 (18), Oct. 14, 1830. Dispatches, Russia, vol. 12. MSS. State Department; Garland's Life of John Randolph, vol. 2, pp. 339-341.

‡E. G. McDonald's Jacksonian Democracy, p. 252.

§J. R. Clay to Randolph, Dec. 3 (15), 1830. Russia, Dispatches, vol. 12. MS. State Department.

||Randolph to Van Buren, Dec. 26, 1830. Ibid.

one concerning neutral rights, and personally directed all the intercourse between Clay and the Russian government.*

Randolph's withdrawal met with the full approval of both the president and his secretary of state. Jackson wrote him, expressing his friendship and that of Van Buren, and requesting to know "truly" in what way he could serve him and granting him permission to return home if his health demanded it.† Van Buren formally instructed him that the president had approved of his having availed himself of his contingent permission to leave his post and that he could return to the United States if he desired,‡ while the continuance of further negotiations with Russia was left to Randolph's discretion.§

Randolph's appointment had raised a storm of disapproval in the United States. The opposition unjustly criticized his conduct at the imperial court, and especially his leaving Russia.|| The first official announcement of Randolph's action was in the president's message to Congress, December 6, 1830, where it was stated that the minister to Russia had been compelled, on account of ill health, to make use of permission given him to leave his post for "a more genial climate," and that he could adequately attend to his duties through his secretary of legation.¶

When the appropriation bill was brought before the House it was found to contain an appropriation of nine thousand dollars for the salary of the minister to Russia. This gave the opposition the opportunity it was looking for to express its opinion of Randolph and his appointment. On June 12, 1831, Stansbery of Ohio moved to strike out the appropriation for the salary of the minister to Russia, inasmuch as the president had informed the House that the United States was not represented at the court of Russia.° This motion was the cause of great debate. The opposition declared that it was not right to pay a minister to Russia when he did not reside there, that Randolph was not qualified to

*Randolph to Van Buren, Oct. 22, Dec. 13, 1830; Jan. 3, Jan. 22, March 30, 1831. J. R. Clay to Randolph, Dec. 3 (15), 1830; Dec. 31 (Jan. 12), 1831. Ibid.

†Jackson to Randolph, Dec. 8, 1830. Jackson MSS. Library of Congress.

‡Van Buren to Randolph, Dec. 2, 1830, Ministers' Instructions, vol. 13. MS. State Department.

§Same to same, Jan. 19, 1831. Ibid.

||E. g. Niles's Weekly Register, vol. 39, pp. 159, 186.

¶Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 3, p. 505.

°Giles and Seaton's Register of Debates in Congress, vol. 7, p. 484.

hold a diplomatic position, that a man complaining as often as Randolph of ill health should not have accepted the position, that Van Buren was responsible for an appointment which would destroy the friendly relations between Russia and the United States, and that it was not in accordance with either constitutional or international law to give a man credentials as minister to Russia and allow him to reside in any country which he might choose. Those who thus spoke in favor of the amendment were from the North and West, while the defenders of Randolph, with the exception of Cambreleng of New York and Buchanan of Pennsylvania, were all Southerners. These latter declared that Randolph's appointment would have no bad effect upon the relations with Russia, that the amendment was an attack upon the president's power of appointment, that it was an attack on Randolph because he was a Virginian, that it was made for political effect as well as from personal venom.

For five days the debate lasted until the patience of the House was exhausted. Then, in spite of the opposition of the leaders of both sides of the discussion, the House, by a vote of 112 to 73, decided to take up the main question and sent the appropriation bill on to its passage.*

In spite of the attack made upon him in Congress and the frequent announcements in his letters to the State Department that his health continued to grow worse, Randolph remained in England. By the last of April, 1831, however, he announced his intention of returning home.† But he could not make up his mind to terminate his mission until July, when he received from his *chargé* an announcement from Nesselrode that the Russian government was so fully occupied with European affairs that it would be impossible for them to make anything like a definite arrangement with the United States.‡ Thereupon in July, 1831, he presented to Prince Lieven, the Russian ambassador to Great Britain, his letter of recall from the president.‡

Randolph had the entire confidence of Jackson and Van Buren. He was entrusted with the negotiation of important treaties. It

*Giles and Seaton's Register of Debates in Congress, vol. 7, pp. 484-674, *passim*.

†Randolph to Secretary of State, April 22, 1831. Russia, Dispatches, vol. 12. MS. State Department.

‡Same to same, July 18, 20, 1831. Ibid.

was his misfortune that he arrived at his post at a time when the outbreak of revolutions in Russia made the Russian government unwilling to negotiate. His stay in Russia was a short one, but not as short as his enemies state it to be. His withdrawal from his post and his subsequent residence in England were with the full consent of the administration. The unsuccessfulness of his mission was not due to lack of effort on his part, although his method of negotiating through a *chargé* was an unusual one.

Ibsen for American Readers*

BY WILLIAM H. WANNAMAKER

Professor of German in Trinity College

The public funeral awarded Henrik Ibsen by the Storting at his death on May 23, 1906, which was attended by the King of Norway, and at which the King of England had his personal representative, was not a tardy recognition of the poet's genius. He had long before won, and till now maintained without question, a remarkable place in the hearts and minds of the cultured world. His funeral was, therefore, not the proverbial stone for bread offered the suffering poet. Indeed, he had also received the best of wine in the goblet of purest gold, craved by Goethe's singer. Since the death of Goethe in 1832, no writer has held so conspicuous a place as Ibsen in the eyes of the world. Of all writers of his time, Tolstoi not excepted, he has probably had the widest hearing and exerted the greatest influence. In his own country he became famous with the publication of "Brand" in 1866, and his fame and influence have steadily grown there, until today it is possible to see in the new nation the fruits of his work. In Germany his influence has been second only to that of Shakspeare, of modern foreign authors, and his works are as well known as those of the best native writers. In that country and in France learned men are making his symbolic poems the subject of earnest study with the hope of finding in them new messages for mankind. Indeed, it would seem that, though dead less than two years, his right to a place among world poets has been established.

In America, speaking relatively, one may say that little is known of Ibsen. Of course he has long had his admirers here, who know and appreciate him. Theater-goers, too, have had chances to see certain of his plays produced. But he has reached far too narrow a circle of our people; for even those plays offered have not been

*The Collected Works of Henrik Ibsen: vol. iii., *Brand*. Translation and Introduction by C. H. Herford, xli. and 262 pp.; vol. iv., *Peer Gynt*. A Dramatic Poem. Translation by William and Charles Archer, with Introduction by William Archer, xxxvi. and 280 pp. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908.

Henrik Ibsen, by Edmund Gosse. Illustrated. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906,—244 pp.

widely produced, and they do not contain his most helpful thought or most beautiful poetry. And of his life almost nothing is known here, for the many newspaper stories told of him during his last years were generally gross exaggerations of his daily life and habits. And yet we cannot afford to be indifferently ignorant of this great poet, to whom art was a sacred obligation and in whose poetry there is ever apparent the endeavor to maintain the harmony between the senses and the spirit. We really need, and ought to secure our share of, his helpfulness. Eminently timely is, therefore, Mr. Gosse's life of the poet, since his works and life ought to be studied together.

Mr. Gosse, one would think, is well equipped to write the life of Ibsen. His long personal acquaintance with the poet, their friendship, his enthusiastic admiration for the poetry of our author, his knowledge of the Dano-Norwegian language, and his own reputation as a writer—all make the reader expect a first-class biography. Unfortunately, however, the book is a disappointment. It is rather a sketch than a complete picture of this unique character of the modern literary world. It contains much information regarding Ibsen, but this is not blended into a satisfying story. In fact, the book lacks the air of finality, of wise, kindly interpretation, and at times makes the impression of having been prepared hastily. Of the poet's personality the reader gets no clear-cut conception, rather a blurred, distorted idea. The effort to portray his personal and intellectual characteristics in the last chapters is not without merit, but they, too, are not satisfying and leave the reader in doubt whether Mr. Gosse has really sounded the deepest depths of Ibsen's sphinx-like personality.

But the essentials for the life story are there, and, though not fascinatingly presented, they interest of themselves. For while Ibsen's personality may not have been one to arouse love, his persevering struggle against almost insuperable obstacles in a crushing environment is one to stimulate us all to effort. Surely few men who have achieved success in the world have begun under less auspicious circumstances. His schooling extended only through his fifteenth year, and then, disappointed of the hope to become a painter because of business reverses of his father, he was forced to spend six long years in the out-of-the-world nook of Grimstad in a drug store among "plasters, pills, and ointment

boxes." When the stirring events of 1848 brought about his intellectual and spiritual re-birth, his education was so meager as to prevent his admission to the university. His determination to follow literature in spite of this meant a heart-breaking struggle with poverty, which he kept up, often worn out in body and bankrupt in courage, but always sustained by a loving, wise wife, till with "Brand" came fame and support.

All this Mr. Gosse has told us, and, furthermore, he has all along kept in consideration "that movement of intellectual life in Norway which has surrounded him and which he has stimulated." His discussions of the more important works are intelligently appreciative, and the information regarding their inception and execution is to the point. Hence the book may well be read, as its author suggests, along with the Archer edition of the poet's works.

This edition will make the complete works of Ibsen accessible to the American reading public, and judging from the volumes I have seen I can say, with Mr. Gosse, that few foreign authors have been edited more completely and satisfactorily. Volumes III. and IV. contain "Brand" and "Peer Gynt," respectively, and of these I shall here add a few words. For, though published in 1866 and 1867 and world famous, they have by no means received in America the attention they deserve.

Both poems were written after Ibsen left his country. Distance made it possible for him to see in truer perspective the fundamental weaknesses and defects in the Norwegian people, and these he held up to them in the most scathing satire. The valuable poetic asset lost in sacrificing nationality, however narrow and narrowing, is made up for by an air of cosmopolitanism and the universality of appeal in these poems. And hence, though addressed directly to his own nation, they have become world poems. And it is to these earlier poems that the remarkably wholesome influence of Ibsen on his nation is due. The later stage plays, however great, such as "Hedda Gabler" and "A Doll's House," are hopelessly pessimistic without the impelling force of a noble indignation so powerful in "Brand."

These poems, "Brand" and "Peer Gynt," belong to the same class of works as Goethe's "Faust," and their similarity with that poem has often been noted. Not that Ibsen owed anything to

Goethe—he is astoundingly original. The similarity is merely that of form and import. In each we have the problem of the relation of the individual to the world: how shall man find genuine contentment? Like "Faust," they are Teutonic both in their Gothic imperfection of form and the intense seriousness and depth of their ethical import. Like Goethe's poem, too, they contain much symbolism, and there are places where the meaning is not clear. But as to the fundamental problem here treated in art form there can be no doubt, and no man can read either poem without advantage to himself.

Poverty of spirit and half-heartedness and the spirit of compromise and lifelessness of faith and hypocritical selfishness never received more telling satire than in "Brand," the hero priest of which proclaims his doctrine: All or Nothing! A serious soul with burning faith in a God, "young like Hercules, no hoary sipper of life's lees," who has done wonders without number and would continue to do them were the age not grown sick, he incorporates unconsciously the problem of self-realization and the relationship of the individual to his surroundings. He himself does not realize where he shall labor, does not comprehend his mission, which he calls a bold daring of "the refashioning of man," till Agnes, the embodiment of self-sacrificing love, divines it thus for him:

"Choose thy endless loss or gain,
Do thy work and bear thy pain."

Like a flash the revelation comes to him that he need not seek far for a field of noble activity; that, as the man seeking a priest for the small mountain church has just told him, he need not fear for the river of his call:

"Though tarn and moorland held it fast,—
As dew 't would reach the sea at last."

And so he exclaims:

"Inwards! In! O word of might,
Now I see my way aright.
In ourselves is that young Earth
Ripe for the divine new birth. . . .
Room within the wide world's span,
Self completely to fulfil,—
That's a valid right of Man,
And no more than that I will!"

And so he devotes his life to the small church in the ice fields and seeks to refashion the lives of his parishioners to accord with his hard and uncompromising doctrine of God service. Of course he meets with insurmountable difficulties. His baby and then his wife fall victims to his blind zeal, and in the end he, too, is defeated; for against the wiles of the Mayor and the Dean, to whose profit it is to keep the people in the old ways of darkness, he can do nothing. And yet his life and doctrine are of the kind that puts iron in a man's blood, that rekindles a warm, life-sustaining faith; and fanatic though he be, his voice is like a trumpet blast to call this cold, compromising, mercenary age back to the paths of duty, though they may not always lead to glory.

Peer Gynt, the hero of the other poem, is the direct counterpart of Brand. In him is embodied everything that the priest condemns, and his long life is depicted through all its phases of vacillation and compromise and petty cowardice till it ends in damnation. This poem is written in much lighter vein than "Brand." The poet's imagination often runs riot, and he seems to find joy in allowing it to go on its mad career. Few long poems contain so many purple patches of poetry of the finest kind: the poetry of the mountains has probably never been more gloriously revealed than here. It abounds in pathos and humor and, of course, satire, but of not so fierce a nature as in "Brand." Where so much is praiseworthy it is useless to attempt to cite all excellent scenes, but I cannot refrain from calling attention to the death-scene of Ase, Peer's mother, which has rightly been called "one of the supreme achievements of modern drama."

In fact, "Peer Gynt" is more original than "Brand," for it is of a more varied nature, and from an ethical standpoint it is equally as deep and true. It is, again, the problem of self-realization. This is made clear in the ninth scene of act five, where Peer, the jolly, winsome, successful dilly-dallier in life, comes near the end of his long life face to face with the Button-moulder. Into the casting ladle of this servant Master Peer must go eventually to be remoulded, since his deeds, good and bad, have been of so petty and insignificant a nature as to make him worthy of neither heaven nor hell. He is in God's eyes, as it were, a button without a hook, and is therefore worthless. For God intended him, as every man, to be something in the world. How find this out

is the question for Gynt, as for us all—how know how to be oneself? The Button-moulder makes that plain:

"To be oneself is: to slay oneself.
But on you that answer is doubtless lost,
And therefore we'll say: to stand forth everywhere
With Master's intention displayed like a signboard."

We must learn, he continues, Master's intention through feeling or divining it. And woe betide us if, like poor Gynt, we are dull in this divining; for in the failure thus to find it out, the devil has "his best hook."

But my purpose was merely to call attention to the significance of these poems, not to enter into a serious discussion of their contents. Indeed, an attempted explanation or interpretation of much of the symbolism in the two poems would demand far more space than is now at my command. And, besides, such an attempted rationalization of what is often poetic fancy, pure and simple, would hinder rather than aid spontaneous enjoyment of both "Brand" and "Peer Gynt." This we have experienced to our sorrow in the case of "Faust" and even "Hamlet." And so for our purpose enough has been said.

BOOK REVIEWS

JUDAH P. BENJAMIN. By Pierce Butler. Philadelphia: George W. Jacobs & Co., 1907,—479 pp.

JEFFERSON DAVIS. By William E. Dodd. Ibid., 396 pp.

The editor and publishers of the "American Crisis Biographies," aiming to present "a biographical history of the great American sectional conflict," have arranged for an unusually large number of Southern biographies. In addition to these under review, lives of Lee and Benton have appeared, and studies of Clay, Calhoun, Stonewall Jackson, Alexander H. Stephens, Alexander Johnson, and Wade Hampton are announced in preparation. Moreover, these are all by Southern men of the present generation who have manifested considerable interest in the study of American history, especially of the South. Impartiality and sympathy, measured by the hand of sectional fellow countrymen, is, therefore, to be expected.

Perhaps no character in Southern history gives more peculiar difficulties than Benjamin. He was very reticent about his personal affairs and kept no file of his correspondence; he spent his last hours in the Confederate service destroying State papers, and in his last days destroyed all of his correspondence that he could lay hands on with the express purpose of frustrating all attempts of biographers to tell the story of his life. Mr. Butler, however, from newspapers, family traditions, scattered letters, and Confederate archives has successfully reconstructed his career. Indeed the work seems to be a painstaking monograph in three sections. First of these is the chapters treating of Benjamin's life before 1860. These are perhaps of most lasting value, for they form a most careful and detailed study of Louisiana politics, really a contribution to the historical literature of the State. Then follow chapters on the relation of Benjamin to the Confederacy, carefully done, but not so impressive as those preceding; for the guiding hand in all Confederate affairs was that of Davis, and it is hard to differentiate between his work and that of Benjamin. Finally, the concluding part of the book describing Benjamin's

life in England and his personality reaches a high level of narrative style and holds the reader with unusual interest.

There is, however, lacking that unity which gives a biography the stamp of "the last word." Perhaps such a biography of Benjamin will never be written; if it is, Mr. Butler's book will at least have cleared the way.

Professor Dodd's work is the first outcome of a nascent interest that has caused the undertaking of three other biographies of Jefferson Davis, yet unpublished. The difficulties of the subject are numerous; not only does the life of Mr. Davis include the history of secession and the Confederacy, but his career was beset with jealousies, enmities, and controversies. It is no easy task, therefore, to do what Professor Dodd has done, to avoid the shoals that might give his work the tone of an apology or a polemic and to make an impartial and critical study of Mr. Davis's relation to Southern history.

In such a work perspective must be an element of saving grace. It is well that 214 pages are given to ante-bellum conditions and politics and 150 to the Confederacy. The economic and social features of the Southwest and Davis's relation to its political problems are described with singular clearness. Only once does the author make known his personal sympathy. "The programme of Davis and his compeers in 1861," he says, "was similar to that which we observe in the industrial system of the United States at the present day. . . . The lords of industry and transportation of the year 1906 are as loath to surrender any of their monopoly rights as were those of 1861; and, according to the view of many acute students, there is as much slavery connected with the later as with the earlier system, and far more hardship and suffering, so that when a great Southern senator, with a half million dollars, equivalent in political power to several millions in our day, threatened to break up the national government, he was doing the same kind of thing, and he afterward assumed the same dictatorial mien that the great Northern senator does when he defies the power of the nation to fix laws which shall regulate the railway traffic of the country. . . . Jefferson Davis was the champion of vested rights; the advantage he had over his younger brother of the present time consisted in the then unexploded doctrine of state supremacy."

In the treatment of the Confederacy, its inherent difficulties, political, military, economic, are well interwoven into the narrative history. The impression thus left is that these problems rather than favoritism and mismanagement so often charged to Davis were the causes of discontent and failure. Such a point of view enables the author to avoid the pitfalls of controversy and apology; it also lessens the intensity so often given the military history of the war; and when the civil history of the Confederacy shall be written, this interpretation will doubtless be re-enforced. The concluding chapter, "After the War," does nothing more than give a narrative of the ex-President's life. An estimate of his power, a portrayal of character, an explanation of his hold on his section are not attempted. Perhaps this deviation from the usual course of a biography is wise. For to simply "relate the story of that remarkably tragic life" and correlate it to the history of the South is needed first of all. The perspective of future years and wider knowledge of the past will bring the final estimate of the man and his work. Within the limits set forth Professor Dodd has succeeded; he has written the first impartial and disinterested life of Jefferson Davis.

W. K. BOYD.

THE SEVEN AGES OF WASHINGTON. By Owen Wister. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1907,—xv., 263 pp.

Mr. Wister has succeeded admirably in drawing a full-length portrait of Washington, with enough of his times to see him clearly against. He has evidently gone at his task with the industry and science of a trained historian, but the result is something other than the work of a specialist in history or biography—in style and in arrangement and in dramatic presentation, it is the work of a literary artist. The sketches of Washington at the various periods of his life, the marshaling of the quotations from his correspondence, the portraits of his contemporaries, and the effective grouping of the facts of his life, are all done with Mr. Wister's accustomed charm and insight. There will be a necessity for other biographies of Washington, as well as for those that have already been written, but it is difficult to see how, within the same space, there could ever be a more accurate and illuminating study or portrait than this.

Mr. Wister's avowed object is to demolish the "frozen image of George Washington, rigid with congealed virtue, ungenial, unreal"—"the priggish, sickening, cherry tree invention." He brings before the reader "the man himself, as he has written himself unwittingly down forever in his letters and diaries—chokeful of vigor, nobility, kindness, public spirit, now breaking out in a fury at some newspaper attack, and now indulging in sedate fun (some-what broad at times)." The natural, manly and human character of Washington stands forth here. "These are the things," says Mr. Wister, after giving illustrations of his sensitiveness to criticism, his anger at "infamous scribblers," and his humor, "these are the things that strike the flash of life and let us see across the long distance the heart of Washington beating and the blood surging to his face." And yet the reader closes the volume with greater admiration than ever—with the feeling that few men ever struggled against greater difficulties or achieved a more signal victory for their fellow men. Washington stands out nobly against the background of the selfishness, provincialism, slander and indifference of his age. For, as Mr. Wister reminds us, "The Revolution was not a sort of flawless architectural fabric, made wholly of colonial pillars and patriotism, but it had a sordid, squalid back door and premises." The disillusionment with regard to "the Fathers" is a marked feature of the book, as is the author's enthusiastic advocacy of Hamilton and his depreciation of Jefferson.

E. M.

THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION. By Frederic Jesup Stimson. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908,—vi., 259 pp.

This volume is made up of the Lowell Institute Lectures delivered at Boston in the fall of 1907. It is a popular discussion of the fundamental liberties of the American people, and of the rights and powers which they have given to the National government and to the States. In clearness of exposition and attractiveness of style, the work is most unusual. In the practical way in which it is related to mooted public questions of the day, it is in a high degree timely.

Professor Stimson does not assent to that prevalent type of political thought which regards the Constitution "as a mass of dry bones," or considers it, at least, "for the most part obsolete—

like the rules of a game which has since so changed its nature that the old rules no longer apply." To him it remains "the very substance of our freedom." With Daniel Webster he holds, in the words of the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780, that ours should "be a government of laws and not of men." The Federal Constitution is the code of the people's liberties, the result of many centuries' growth.

In discussing the division of powers under the Constitution, Professor Stimson makes a strong plea for the preservation of the rights entrusted to the States. He sees danger to the liberties of the American people in the increasing centralization of governmental power at Washington for which warrant is sought in extreme and strained interpretations of the Constitution. The States, in his opinion, can deal adequately with many of the matters in which Federal intervention is urged. In other cases, where Federal action is proper, the methods proposed are dangerous. It is hardly necessary to state that in many respects Professor Stimson is a vigorous critic of President Roosevelt's actions and policies.

W. H. G.

THE ART OF WILLIAM BLAKE. By Elizabeth Luther Cary. New York: Moffat, Yard & Co., 1907.

STUDIES IN POETRY. By Stopford A. Brooke. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1907.

Miss Cary's book is, in truth, a contribution. Two-thirds of its space is given over to reproductions of Blake's drawings and paintings. This is the first time that many of them have ever been reproduced, the originals being in the private collection of Mr. W. A. White, of Brooklyn. Of great interest are certain hitherto inaccessible sketches of designs already known, adding to our data concerning the way Blake's mind worked in matters pictorial. The illustrations as a whole throw much light on the inter-relation between his art and his verse. And, just as Mr. John Sampson has called attention to the unity of Blake's writings and to the "absolute uniformity with which symbolical figures are used to express definite conceptions in his poetry," Miss Cary insists upon the applicability of the same remarks to his art.

A few years ago one's perspective would have been questioned

who included an essay on Blake (and that the first) in a volume of studies otherwise devoted to Scott, Shelley, and Keats. That such a sane critic as Mr. Brooke should do this thing suggests that Blake's reputation has risen, that the attention recently bestowed upon him has resulted in distinct gain. The essay is calm, dispassionate, well balanced,—a judicious survey of Blake's historic position and of the characteristics of his poetry.

University of Louisville.

L. N. CHASE.

THE ANCIENT LAW. By Ellen Glasgow. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1908,—485 pp.

While Miss Glasgow's latest novel has a large human value that makes it truly cosmopolitan and universal, the setting is distinctively Southern. Readers who were disappointed in the "Wheel of Life" and who explained their disappointment by the fact that the author had written about New York rather than Virginia, will rejoice that in the "Ancient Law" she returns to the land and people that she knows best. The Southern background is not emphasized nearly so much as in her earlier works, but it is all the more effective because the art of suggestion is brought into play. The crude factory village contrasts vividly with the dilapidated and yet picturesque old Southern home where the Brookes live. Mr. Beverly Brooke, pompous in his poverty, is a fine type of the run-down gentry, while his sister, who carries about with her the atmosphere of old libraries and is the incarnation of Southern refinement, is alert and vigorous, eager to seize new opportunities of service. "Was it some temperamental disgust for the hereditary idleness which had spurred her on to take issue with the worn-out traditions of her ancestors and to place herself among the labouring rather than the leisure class?" She is the spirit of the future rising amid the decaying sentiment of the past. Daniel Ordway, who is likewise a descendant of Virginia aristocrats and has served seven years in a prison, struggles toward the same ideals of service in the village which he enters as an unknown workman. In two years' time he aroused and vitalized the community. Tappahannock is the child of his brain. He is, therefore, a type of the Southerner of a new era struggling in a constructive way to bring into being a new democracy.

In this, as in all her other novels, Miss Glasgow shows that she is a thinker as well as an artist. She has humor and pathos, and rare insight into human nature. She has distinction of style, too. But in dealing with the Southern situation—always artistically—, she is in striking contrast with those Southern story-writers and novelists who write as if, with the decline of the Old South, the richest elements in Southern life passed away. In all her novels there is a suggestion of the glory of a new era, distinguished by the ideals of service and genuine democracy. From this standpoint her novels have a large social value. E. M.

THE OLD DOMINION: HER MAKING AND HER MANNERS. By Thomas Nelson Page. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908,—ix., 394 pp.

In 1888 Mr. Page, in an address at Washington and Lee University, hailed the future historian of the Old South. "What nobler task can he set himself," he said, "than this, to preserve from oblivion, or worse, from misrepresentation, a civilization which produced as its natural fruit Washington and Lee? . . . Standing here beside the sacred ashes of the noblest exponent of that civilization, which I have attempted to outline, delivering my message from this University, I hail the future historian of the Old South." In the years that have elapsed since those words were spoken, Mr. Page has himself done more than any other living man to interpret Virginia—her social and political life—to the world. Now in glowing essay or sketch and yet again with the charm of the creative artist, he has told the story of the Virginia gentlemen and gentlewomen who brought forth a new civilization "where Character and Courtesy went hand in hand; where the goal ever set before the eye was Honor, and where the distinguishing marks of the life were Simplicity and Sincerity."

The present volume is made up of addresses and articles that are written from this point of view. Resenting the one-sided narratives of early American history, he points the reader to the early history of Virginia as the real beginning of the life of the Republic. The chapters "The Beginning of America," "Jamestown, the Birthplace of the American People," "Colonial Life" and "The Revolutionary Movement" give evidence of the careful investigator and the interesting essayist. He tells again, in more popular form,

the story of the founding and early history of the University of Virginia, which has so long been the pride of Virginia and, indeed, of the South. "The Southern People during Reconstruction" sets forth in more definite form the facts which formed the background of "Red Rock;" while "An Old Neighborhood in Virginia" and "An Old Virginia Sunday" are sketches in Virginia life which suggest many of the author's short stories. Surely Virginia and the nation at large will value highly the persistent and enthusiastic labors of Mr. Page. E. M.

CONSTITUTION AND ENABLING ACT OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA. Compiled by Clinton O. Bunn and William C. Bunn. Ardmore, Okla.: Bunn Brothers, 1907,—195 pp.

The constitution of the new State of Oklahoma has been the subject of so much discussion throughout the country that students of political science will give a hearty welcome to this accurate and well indexed edition of the text. Whether one praises or censures the many novel provisions of the document, he certainly will be glad to have at hand a reliable and exact presentation of the convention's work. Doubtless this volume will be much in demand for the libraries of colleges, universities, and law schools, as well as for the use of such private citizens as are interested in the study of modern tendencies in American State government.

The actual text of the constitution occupies about 130 pages. In the remainder of the volume are contained the enabling act and amendments, and indices. Among the provisions of the constitution which have an especial interest for the citizens of other States are those regarding the initiative and referendum, the control of railroad and public service corporations, the verdict by three-fourths of a jury in civil and minor criminal cases, and the granting of jury trial in cases of contempt of an injunction. This new fashioned constitution does not confine itself to providing the framework and fundamental principles of government. In many of its provisions it goes into such details as are usually left for legislative action. However, the process of amendment is comparatively simple. The ultimate appeal to the people is made easy, and the document is full of a spirit of confidence in the wisdom of their decision. W. H. G.

GRANT, LINCOLN, AND THE FREEDMEN: REMINISCENCES OF THE CIVIL WAR. By John Eaton, in collaboration with Ethel Osgood Mason. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1907,—vii., 331 pp.

The principal service of General Eaton in the Civil War was that of superintendent of negro affairs in the Mississippi Valley under Grant. His activities in this work lend interest to these reminiscences. While they do not contribute any new knowledge to the subject, the personal element in the description of the conditions within the Federal lines accentuates the vastness of the problem of the freedmen and the earnestness with which the military authorities faced it. The author also had other relations with General Grant and President Lincoln than those arising from freedmen's affairs. Chief of these was his negotiation between them in regard to the election in 1864. He was sent by Lincoln to interview Grant and find his attitude toward the movement to make him President. Grant emphatically expressed his refusal to be a candidate. The explanation of rumors of Grant's dissipation during the war is of equal interest. On the whole, while the style and subject matter make every page interesting reading, the book seems to be of less permanent value than most of the reminiscences of the period that have recently appeared. Miss Mason contributes a biographical sketch as an introduction.

W. K. BOYD.

INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF MODERN EUROPE. By Archibald Weir. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1907,—viii., 340 pp.

This book has a worthy purpose. It aims to describe those new movements in Europe during the last part of the eighteenth century which form the background of contemporary civilization. It represents the present reaction against the purely political interpretations of history; for intellectual influences, economic changes, literary currents, scientific achievements, even progress in philosophy, are outlined in addition to political events, and political affairs are so treated as to make an interpretation of political development rather than a historical narrative. In a time when historians are turning more and more to social phenomena for sources and when those interested in the social sciences are adopting the historical method, there is ample room for such a work as this analysis suggests. But the limitations are too narrow for the

title. The political history ends with the reaction that followed the overthrow of the Napoleonic Empire, and the other subjects are given the same time limitation. The style, moreover, suggests the philosopher rather than the man of affairs or the statesman. The book lacks some of that objective element which has always had a large part in the making of history. For practical use in the class room it is not suited; it is too general in subject matter to add to the teacher's stock of knowledge; perhaps for those students of philosophy who touch the borderland of modern history it is well suited as an introductory manual.

W. K. BOYD.

